

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—*Town*, 26s.; *Country*, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—*cloth*, 2s. 6d., *half law calf*, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The SOLICITORS' JOURNAL.

LONDON, MARCH 3, 1877.

CURRENT TOPICS.

WE UNDERSTAND that the new Railway Commissioner, Mr. A. E. Miller, Q.C., is to take his seat on Monday next. Mr. Miller's legal experience, acuteness, and singular power of dealing with evidence will stand the Commission in good stead, and when so excellent an appointment is made, the public may well condone the delay which has occurred in its completion.

UP TO THE TIME OF GOING TO PRESS we have not been able to obtain a print of the Bill for appointing an additional judge of the High Court to be attached to the Chancery Division; but if we are correctly informed, the impression left by the Attorney-General's speech on the chancery block will prove to be accurate. After Mr. Osborne Morgan's admirable and conclusive statement, it was impossible to deny that the position of matters is scandalous, but, instead of stating that it was proposed to obtain power to appoint a new judge with a proper staff, the Attorney-General mysteriously suggested that "if an additional judge were appointed he might deal with those causes which had come to the Chancery Division as *assistant to the judges of that division*." Can be intended that the new judge shall be a wandering deputy, or "gentleman help," to the Master of the Rolls and the Vice-Chancellors? It is certain that a new judge without a staff would be, for all practical purposes, useless. He would merely shift a portion of the block from court to chambers, where it is bad enough already. But past experience tells us how useless all remonstrance against such a ridiculous expedient would be if it has been determined upon by the Treasury. In all these matters there seems to be but one real authority, the Treasury. That department has neither eyes to see the state of the cause lists nor ears to hear the complaints of the suitors; but it has a wonderfully keen nose for fees, and we cannot but admire the adroitness with which Mr. Morgan deftly placed under its nostrils the acceptable savour of a clear gain of £5,000 a year on the new chancery judge. The speedy appearance of the new Bill is the best testimony to the success of this little device.

A STRIKING EXEMPLIFICATION of the ignorance which prevails amongst the mercantile community of the most rudimentary doctrines of English law is to be observed in the excitement caused in the City by two recent decisions, one of Mr. Justice Field, the other of Mr. Justice Grove, who had sold certain tobacco but was allowed, for the vendee's convenience, to retain part of it in bond in his own name, was not the vendee's agent within the meaning of the Factors Acts so as to be able,

by fraudulently pledging the dock warrants (which were in the vendor's own name) representing such part, to give a good title to a *bona fide* pledgee for value as against the vendee, the real owner of the tobacco. Whether those decisions were right or wrong, this at least might have been supposed to have been known to bankers and men of business generally, that a dock warrant is not what lawyers call a negotiable security, so as to enable the holder, apart from the Factors Acts, to convey a better title than his own to a *bona fide* transferee for value. And yet, from the indignant and astonished comments to which these cases have given rise amongst men of business and journals devoted to mercantile topics, one would suppose that the Factors Acts, with their carefully drawn distinctions, and the decisions which led to their being enacted, had never been heard of before, and that now, for the first time, bankers were awaking to the idea that a dock warrant was of any less value as a document of title than a bank-note. Indeed, unless we are mistaken, the Bill recently introduced in the House of Commons by Sir John Lubbock in consequence of those decisions did, as originally drawn, put the two classes of documents on a level with each other. The Bill, however, has not yet been printed, and as we understand that Mr. Watkin Williams, Q.C., is co-operating in the preparation and production of the Bill, his experience and reputation as a commercial lawyer are a guarantee that the measure will be carefully framed with a view to other difficulties than the particular one which it is designed to meet, and other interests than those of bankers who wish to be perfectly safe in advancing money upon such securities.

To make bills of lading, dock warrants, delivery orders, and other documents of title to goods, negotiable securities in the strict sense of the word would, no doubt, be a sweeping measure which would greatly ease the minds of bankers, get rid of many niceties of distinction to which the Factors Acts have given rise, and afford greatly increased facilities for fraud. But it must not be forgotten that documents of title, as representing actual existing goods, are in their nature essentially different from *chores in action*, such as bills of exchange or bank-notes. To make the former negotiable like the latter would be to make the symbol more efficacious than the thing symbolized. We are far from saying that the interests of the community do not require such a measure, and, if so, by all means let it become law. But let us all see plainly the consequences to which it would lead. For instance, is it, or is it not, desirable that a thief or a finder of a bill of lading indorsed in blank should be able, by means of it, to give to a *bona fide* transferee for value a good title to the goods represented by it? or that a person who has intrusted his furniture or plate to a bailee, such as a packer, warehouseman, or servant, shall be deprived of his goods if the bailee deposits them in a warehouse and obtains a delivery order, which he transfers for value? One plan has been suggested which might possibly get rid of the latter difficulty—namely to confine the negotiability of such documents to cases where they represent a registered class of produce (including all ordinary articles of commerce) either at sea or in registered docks, wharves, or warehouses. The subject is one of the greatest interest and importance, and we rejoice to see it under the united consideration of men of business and lawyers. But we must confess to serious doubts whether it will be found feasible to do more than slightly extend the class of agents who, under the Factors Acts, can give a better title than their own. In other cases the danger of fraud comes under the category of bankers' risks.

WE HAVE MUCH PLEASURE in laying before our readers the draft of a measure with which Mr. Josiah W. Smith, Q.C., Judge of County Courts, proposes to enrich the

statute-book, and as to which, at the Hereford County Court, on the 20th ult., he announced his desire that it should be "made public throughout the length and breadth of the land." The late Mr. J. S. Mill frequently lamented the decline of individuality and independence, and although there are still many brilliant examples of these qualities on the county court bench, we must confess that on some circuits there is to be observed a monotonous adherence to the terms of the statutes enacted by the Legislature, and a somewhat servile deference to the decisions of the (so-called) superior courts. To remedy this state of things Mr. Smith has drafted a short but comprehensive Bill, which we give *verbatim*, as we find it in a local newspaper, only altering the type of a few words and throwing the measure into clauses. It is as follows:—

"I. Subject to any plain enactment or plain agreement to the contrary, and subject to the established rules of law, where an exception to such rules is not called for by the circumstances, all cases in litigation, other than cases of construction, shall, in the discretion and to the best of the judgment of the judge or judges deciding the same, be decided, so far as may be, according to **JUSTICE, MORAL RIGHT, AND PUBLIC POLICY.**"

"II. All cases of doubtful construction shall, in the discretion and to the best of the judgment of the judge or judges deciding such last-mentioned cases, be decided according to the presumable intention of the parties or testators."

"III. But the operation of this enactment shall be subject to any previous decisions of the Superior Courts, clearly and absolutely governing the cases in litigation, in the opinion of the judge or judges deciding such cases."

Here the proposed statute ends; but as we are convinced that a portion of the draft must have failed to reach the reporter of the local paper, we venture to append one more clause which seems necessary to complete this admirable "Act for giving greater effect to the true principles of judicial decision":—

"IV. All cases in litigation shall be decided in the following manner, that is to say:—There shall be furnished, for the use of each county court, one or more small discs of bronze; such discs shall be provided by her Majesty's Mint, and shall bear on the one side the image of her Most Gracious Majesty, and on the other side a sitting image or figure representing Britannia. When a case shall be called, one of the said discs shall be placed before the judge by the registrar, and the said judge, taking the same between his thumb and forefinger, shall thereupon direct that the said image of her Majesty shall represent, for the purposes of the case, the arguments for the plaintiff, and the said image of Britannia the arguments for the defendant, and shall forthwith to the best of his ability toss the said disc. If upon such tossing the said disc shall so descend that the said image of her Majesty shall remain uppermost, judgment shall be given in favour of the plaintiff; if otherwise, for the defendant."

IT HAS BEEN OUR DUTY at various times to say some hard things of the official referees; but no one possessing any bowels of compassion can fail to commiserate their present condition. After months of leisurely loneliness, they have been cruelly dragged into public view by the Attorney-General, who, after premising that they "had not had much work to do," intimated that, in his opinion, the fees payable by suitors ought to be either diminished or abolished altogether; but we regret to say the learned gentleman omitted to inform us by whom the "fee for subsistence" and the "cost of locomotion," when the official referees sit in the country, are in future to be paid. It appears that the subsistence necessary for an official referee costs £1 11s. 6d. per night—that, at least, is the fee charged—while the official referee's clerk (not being under the same necessity for partaking of phosphates to keep up his brain-power) can get along on 15s. per night. Are the official referees to furnish their own provender, or are they to be "done for" by a

grateful nation? Either way we foresee a season of tribulation for these unfortunate gentlemen. Suppose the official referee has to provide his own "subsistence," and is absent from town only 100 nights in the year; that, at £2 6s. 6d. per night for himself and clerk, would dock his salary to the extent of £232 10s. a year. If, on the other hand, the official referee has to send in his hotel bills to be repaid by the Treasury, he will be subjected to continual annoyance with reference to any little luxuries he may have enjoyed. He will infallibly be surcharged his cigars, and will have to pay out of his own pocket for the generous wine with which he may have cheered himself after the day's labours. Which ever way we look the prospect seems gloomy in the extreme; but we have not yet revealed the darkest part of it. The official referees are to fill up their spare time in doing any odd jobs of judicial scavenging which may be required by way of "getting rid of the surplus business at chambers."

THE COSTS OF A SUCCESSFUL SUITOR.

We are glad to observe that Sir H. M. Jackson, Q.C., has embodied in a Bill the substance of the clause as to costs which he unsuccessfully moved during the progress through Parliament of the Judicature Act, 1875. The rejection of that proposal was mainly due to an unreasoning and ignorant panic on the part of learned members belonging to the common law bar, who seemed to see in the reference in the clause to taxation as between solicitor and client a design that the successful litigant should obtain from his opponent every charge which a solicitor could devise or an easy-going client could be induced to pay. If these learned gentlemen had taken the trouble to inquire, they would have discovered how very far this is from being the case in taxation as between solicitor and client. This red rag, which caused so much perturbation, has been removed from the present Bill, with the result, as it seems to us, of rendering doubtful and irregular what, under the former proposal, would have been more clear and uniform. As the clause originally stood it provided that the costs should include "all such costs, charges, and expenses as are allowed by the Court of Chancery whenever costs, charges, and expenses are directed to be taxed on the principle of taxation as between solicitor and client, and to be paid out of a fund." It seems to us better expressly to refer to the system of taxation as between solicitor and client, and so *unequivocally* to point to a well-established series of rules, than to leave the matter as it is left by the words of the present Bill—"all other costs, charges, and expenses reasonably incurred in or incidental to or for the purposes of the proceeding."

As to the main reason in favour of the proposal, we do not know that we can put it better than it was put by Sir A. Lusk in the debate on the question in the House of Commons. He said he knew fifty men in London, and he was one of them, who would suffer injustice rather than go to law. As Mr. Osborne Morgan pithily expressed it the other day in the House of Commons, there are thousands of persons in England who deliberately consent to have their pockets picked because they are more afraid of the law than of the law breaker. Justice, in fact, is sometimes not worth having at the rate at which it is offered. There are few solicitors, we imagine, who have not had to advise clients to follow Sir A. Lusk's example, because the taxed costs would be so utterly disproportionate to the actual expenditure. Can any one doubt that this is a grievous scandal?

But it is said that the result of the change would be to multiply speculative actions. Do the people who urge this objection ever consider that the new rule would cut both ways? Supposing Sir H. M. Jackson's Bill passes into law, the result would be, no doubt, to make it a much safer thing to bring an action founded on a

righteous claim, and therefore likely to be successful. That, we say, would be a good thing. But, on the other hand, would it not be a very much more dangerous thing to bring an action founded on a doubtful or wrongful claim? It would be a very disastrous thing to fail, and to have to pay all costs, charges, and expenses reasonably incurred. If this is so, the result of the change would be to make people very careful to ascertain, before they commence proceedings, that their claim is a righteous and substantial claim. This, we say, would also be a good thing.

There seems to be a notion abroad in the House that the proposal is made in the interest of solicitors. We do not deny that solicitors feel strongly on the subject; because of course they see, more than any one else, the evil and injustice which are wrought by the present system. But it is the client, not the solicitor, who is mainly interested in the proposal. The solicitor looks to his client to pay him the costs disallowed by the taxing master under the present system; and it can matter comparatively little to him whether he is paid them by his client or by the opposite party; but to the client it is a matter of the utmost moment whether he will be indemnified for his necessary outlay in enforcing his rights, or whether he will find, after all his anxiety and trouble, that the game is not worth the candle.

ADULTEROUS LARCENY.

THE "Mirrour of Justices," a work of great, although uncertain, antiquity, gives the following definition of larceny*—"Larcinie is the treacherously taking away from another moveables corporeall, against the will of him to whom they do belong, by evil getting of the possession or the use of them. It is said—*Taking*, for bailing or delivery is not in the case. . . . It is said *Treacherously*, because that if the taker of them away conceive the goods to be his owne, and that he may well take them, in such case it is no offence. Nor in case where one conceives that it pleaseth the owner of the goods that he take them, but thereof there ought to be apparent presumption and evidence. There be two parts of larcinie, one which is done openly in the day by robbery. The other which is done in the night or in the twilight. Robbery is done sometimes by (1) thieves, and . . . (4) by others, who run away with other men's wives or wards and their goods."

Of the many definitions of larceny there is perhaps none which conveys such an intelligible idea of the true nature of the offence as the above. That where there was a bailment or delivery of goods, the taking by the bailee was not such a taking as would amount to larceny was early settled, and the ancient author above cited records with approval of King Alfred that "He hanged Wolmer because he judged Graunt to death by colour of a larcinie of a thing which he had received by title of baylement," p. 242 (ed. 1646). Where, however, a man delivers his goods to his wife or servants the goods are still deemed to remain in the *constructive possession* of the master, and the relationship of bailor and bailee is not considered to arise. "Yet, so far as possession is concerned, the position of a servant, who is not a slave, cannot be distinguished in principle from that of a bailee. But, however this may be, it has long been settled that if a servant have possession of his master's goods, and appropriate them to himself, he is guilty of larceny" (Roscoe on Evidence in Crim. Cases, 6th ed. p. 585). Now, the master of a house might bail goods to a stranger, and likewise the members of the household might bail them to the stranger so as to justify the latter in thinking that the delivery to him was authorized, and "that it pleaseth the owner of the goods that he take them," and this would especially be the case if the member of the household were the wife of the master.

* We cite, of course, from the translation, which alone is extant.

Therefore the bailee, under such ordinary circumstances, would not be guilty of larceny.

Let us pause here to briefly notice the ancient legal relations of husband and wife. The husband had *seisin* of the wife. If she went or was taken away he could recover her, and the "Mirrour" says "If it were that a woman after the marriage were ravished and consented thereto, and the husband replevée (*replevy*); her," the ravisher could not set up in answer that the marriage was informal or that the husband "never was out of *seisin* of the woman because she was clothed with his robes, and by her robe she remained in his *seisin*"; and the dis courteous old lawyer soon after speaks of a man dying as well seised of a certain tenement "as he should be of a woman or a horse" (p. 235). She had not, at least from the feudal age until the present time, and still has not any property in her husband's goods during his lifetime. She had, however, an important *contingent* right in his lands, viz., that of dower, the doctrine relating to which entered largely into the feudal law. Glanville, who, it will be remembered, was a Chief Justice of Henry II., treating of this subject, says "If the wife should, in the lifetime of her husband be separated from him on account of incontinence, the woman shall not be heard upon a claim of dower" (Lib. 6 c. 17). This principle of law was affirmed in the time of Edward I. by the Statute of Westminster the 2nd, cap. 34, which, after providing against the crime of rape by a clause now repealed, enacts "*De mulieribus abductis cum bonis viri habea Rex sectam de bonis sic asportatis*," and this, together with a subsequent clause as to forfeiture of dower, is thus translated. "And of woman carried away with the goods of their husbands, the king shall have the suit for the goods so taken away. And if a wife willingly leave her husband and go away and continue with her adviser, she shall be barred for ever of action to demand her dower, that she ought to have of her husband's lands if she be convict thereupon, except that her husband willingly and without coercion of the church, reconcile her and suffer her to dwell with him, in which case she shall be restored to her action." Here we have a proceeding against the adulterer, and a severe punishment on the wife, viz., deprivation of dower. If the wife herself took away the goods of the husband he would have a sharp remedy in his own hand, he could re-take both them and her. But could he take criminal proceedings against her for *stealing* them?

The oldest authority on the point we can find is Fitzherbert's Abridgment (A.D. 1565, Tit. Cor. fol. 260, 455), wherein it seems to have been said and conceded at the bar "*que femme ne puit emble les biens de son baron*," and a single reference only is given, viz., to a case in Hilary Term, 21 Hen. 6, which we have not been able to discover. In A.D. 1583, Stomforde (P. C.) cites the passage from Fitzherbert, adding "*ne si el eux prist et donna a autre, ceo nest felonie in le done*." Referring to, and apparently relying upon, these authorities alone to support his proposition, Lord Coke subsequently wrote in a Chapter on Larceny (3rd Inst.), fol. 110, "The wife cannot steal the goods of her husband, for they be not the goods of another; for the husband and wife are *one person in law*, *Duo unum in carne und*." Mr. Dalton, a very intelligent author of the seventeenth century, whose statements of the criminal law have been so frequently adopted and confirmed by Lord Hale that they have acquired a reputation which they certainly deserve, but might not otherwise have gained, writing on the same subject says ("Country Justice" ed. 1705) that the "wife shall not be accounted a felon for taking or stealing the goods of her husband; and if the wife do take her husband's goods secretly and deliver them to a stranger knowing thereof, yet this is no felony in the stranger." He then deals with the provision of the Statute of Westminster the 2nd. "But if a man do take away another man's wife with her husband's goods against the

wife's will, this is felony by the statute Westminster 2 c. 34, as it seemeth, and so if any man takes away another man's wife with her husband's goods against the husband's will this is also felony. *If a married woman shall deliver to her adulterer her husband's goods, this is felony in the adulterer.*—*Lecture, Mr. Cook* (c. 104, p. 268). The lecture referred to is not now discoverable. Lord Hale, whose works were edited in 1680, however, for once does not concur with Dalton, but says, "The wife cannot commit felony of the goods of her husband, for they are one person in law, and therefore if she takes or steals the goods of her husband and delivers them to B., who knowing it, carries them away, this seems no felony on B., for it is taken *quasi* by the consent of the husband; yet trespass lies against B. for such taking, for it is a trespass, but, *in favorem vita*, it shall not be adjudged a felony, and so I take the law to be, notwithstanding the various opinions: 1 Hale 514; Dalt. c. 104, pp. 268, 269; *ex lect: Cooke.*"

Now, in the face of these authorities, and having regard to the extreme unlikelihood of a husband, who has a right to re-take his goods from his guilty wife, ever condescending to prosecute her for larceny when he is suffering from the far greater injury she, by her misconduct, has done him, it is not surprising that no case should be found in the books where a husband has preferred an indictment for larceny *against his wife*. Numerous modern instances, however, exist of his setting the criminal law in motion *against the adulterer*, and convicting him of *larceny* in cases where he has either taken part of the goods with his own hand or has been constructively a joint taker of them with the wife, or has even received them from her. Thus in *R. v. Featherstone* (1 Dears C. C. 369) the jury found the adulterer guilty of *larceny* "on the ground that he received the sovereigns from the wife, and that she took them without the authority of her husband." The court held that the conviction was right. "The general rule," said Campbell, C.J., in giving judgment, "is that a wife cannot be convicted of larceny for stealing the goods of her husband. It is no larceny in her to carry away her husband's goods, as husband and wife are one. But the law has properly qualified that general rule by saying that if a wife commit adultery and then steal the goods of her husband with the adulterer, she has *determined her quality of wife*, and is no longer looked upon as having any property in the goods, and the person who assists her is guilty of larceny. I think the case of the prisoner must be considered in the same light as if he had taken the goods himself. This is not the case of a receiving of the goods from the wife, but the prisoner is supposed actually to have assisted her in taking them. It is said in 'Russell on Crimes,' 'If the wife steal the goods of her husband and deliver them to B., who, knowing it, carries them away, B. being the adulterer of the wife, this, according to a very good opinion, would be felony in B., for in such case no consent of the husband can be presumed.' That is this very case. The prisoner was the adulterer of the wife, and knew that the goods had been carried away without the consent of the husband. This case is within the express authority of the rule, which is first laid down in Dalton (c. 104, p. 268), and is to be found in every book on the criminal law." The principle involved in this decision seems to be that the money was in the constructive possession of the husband while it remained in the hands of the wife; that her implied authority to part with possession was impliedly revoked upon her misconduct, and that, therefore, the adulterer, taking the money from her, took it out of the *possession of her husband*, and could not set up any authorized delivery by the wife which would prevent such taking being larcenous.

That case, as Lord Campbell said, was not one where the prisoner was charged with the statutory offence of *receiving stolen goods*. But in *R. v. Deer* (32 L. J. M. C. 33) the prisoner, who lodged at the prosecutor's

house, left it, and the next day the prosecutor's wife also left, taking a bundle with her, which, however, was not large enough to contain the things which, on the evening she left, were missed from the house. Two days after, all the things were found in the prisoner's cabin, or on his person, in a ship in which the wife was, she and the prisoner having taken their passage as man and wife. The prisoner was indicted for receiving the goods knowing the same to have been stolen by *some evilly disposed person*. The jury convicted him, and the conviction was upheld. But the question whether an adulterer could be convicted of the offence of receiving stolen goods when he could only have received them from the hands of *the wife* arose more distinctly in the very recent case of *Reg. v. Kenny*, where a wife, having an intrigue with the prisoner, and having taken a quantity of her husband's money and goods, absconded from her home in Staffordshire, and was followed some weeks afterwards by the prisoner to Chester, at which city they cohabited, and the adulterer was seen in possession of the goods. He was tried in Chester upon an indictment of two counts, one charging him with larceny, and the other with receiving the goods of the prosecutor. The jury found him guilty of *receiving* only, and the question came on the 10th inst. before the Court for Crown Cases Reserved as to whether that conviction could be sustained. On the opening of the case the court asked if there could be a receiver without a thief; and then, if a wife could steal her husband's goods? Counsel for the Crown contended that *Reg. v. Deer* was in point. The court said part of the goods there might well have been stolen by somebody other than the wife, and the finding of the jury was justified. Counsel next relied on the expression made use of by Lord Campbell in *Reg. v. Featherstone*, that by the adultery the "woman determined her quality of wife," but the judges thought such might be the case as regarded her implied authority so as to render her adulterer guilty of *larceny*, but that her *status* of wife must exist until death or divorce. To the argument that the phrase "husband and wife are one" was only a compendious and metaphorical mode of saying that, under ordinary circumstances, she was so identified in interest with him as to have reason to believe he would permit her to have control over his goods, so that her taking of them would not be *animo furandi*, but that it would be impossible for her to draw any such presumption when breaking her marriage vows, the judicial answer was given by the maxim "husband and wife are one." Equally vain was the contention that the Crown and not the husband would be the real prosecutor of the wife for larceny, and that therefore the anomalies which prevent spouses suing each other in civil actions did not arise; that society and not the individual was interested in the punishment of the crime, and that the law did in fact subject a wife to punishment for offences against the *person* of her husband on his nominal prosecution. The court unanimously and unhesitatingly decided that a wife cannot steal her husband's goods, and that, as the goods in question were clearly taken by her and no one else, they were not *stolen*, and the prisoner could not therefore be convicted of feloniously *receiving them knowing them to have been stolen*.

A point of some doubt has thus been set at rest, and a singular privilege has been authoritatively established in favour of wives by means of a maxim which has often been cruelly used for their oppression. The married woman may be congratulated on an immunity which is almost unique. A trade partner, who is joint-owner of goods, can now be convicted, by statute, of stealing them; a bailee is similarly liable; a servant who changes the constructive possession of his master into an actual possession by himself is also punishable for the crime; but a wife, although she may have no legal interest in her husband's goods beyond bare possession, and cannot be reasonably supposed to believe that "it pleaseth the owner of the goods that

she take them" when she leaves him for the purpose of committing adultery, yet has such a right—whatever it may be—as entitles her to say, "They are mine," or, "I have leave to appropriate them whatever I do." The result is that if a wife gives her husband a mere physical blow, the State may interfere and send her to gaol, because she might assault others, who must be protected, and she must be cured of a troublesome propensity; but if she takes from her husband the savings of a lifetime, and also deprives him of his honour and his peace of mind, the State answers the complaint of the man and of society with the ancient formula, "Husband and wife are one."

Reviews.

CRIMES.

A TREATISE ON CRIMES AND MISDEMEANOURS. By Sir WILLIAM OLDNALL RUSSELL, Knight, late Chief Justice of Bengal. In three vols. Fifth Edition. By SAMUEL PRENTICE, Esq., Q.C. Stevens & Sons; H. Sweet; W. Maxwell & Son.

The changes made in this edition of "Russell" are not important. There has been some re-arrangement of the matter; the title of *pleas autrefois convict and acquit*, for instance, which in the last edition was eccentrically assigned mainly to the chapter on "Burglary," has been properly placed among the "general provisions" in the first chapter; the position of some chapters has been altered, and some cases have been transferred from one chapter to another. The new statute law down to 1875 has been added in the proper places, and that of 1876 is given in an appendix to vol. 3, with the exception of the Trade Union Acts, which we find in their appropriate position in the text of that volume. We have not been able, however, to discover the Drugging of Animals Act, 1876 (39 & 40 Vict. c. 13), either in the text or the appendix.

So far as our investigation enables us to judge, we think the cases have been collected with care. The faults we have to find are, first, that the editor does not always grapple with the difficulties raised by the decisions, and next, that he is not sufficiently careful to condense his matter. As to the first point, we may take as an instance, the mode in which the important case of *R. v. Prince* (24 W. R. 76) is treated. The editor, after (p. 388) briefly stating the facts and decision in the text, says, in a note, "This case was not argued for the prisoner. It must be considered that this decision, whether right or wrong, has settled the difficult question raised in this case." Considering that fifteen judges in the supreme criminal tribunal concurred in the decision, it does not seem to require any great penetration to discover this result. The note proceeds: "The judgment of Mr. Justice Brett, the dissenting judge, will well repay perusal. An extract from it is given below. It goes fully into the principle of law that *actus non facit reum nisi mens sit rea*. It is difficult to reconcile this decision with the above rule or principle. See *infrā* what Bramwell, B., says as to the *mens rea*. See *Watkins v. Major* 44 L. J. M. C. 164." And then follows an extract from the judgment of Bramwell, B., and the latter half of the judgment of Brett, J., quoted *verbatim*. And that is all on one of the most difficult and interesting points which has arisen in very recent criminal law. Not a word of independent comment is given as to the effect of the decision upon such cases as *Reg. v. Hibbert* (17 W. R. 384) and *R. v. Green* (3 F. & F. 274). A short note of the decision in the former case is given in the text on pp. 880–891, and in a note a reference is given to *R. v. Green*, and it is added, "and see *per* Brett, B. (sic) in *R. v. Prince*, ante, p. 388, note (a)."

As regards the second point, we do not complain that

the book is a big one. In spite of the recent protests of a learned codifier, we are unable to believe that a complete book on so vast a subject as our criminal law can be otherwise than bulky. We shall see by-and-by, no doubt, how far Sir J. F. Stephen succeeds in expressing the whole of the criminal law "in about 300 moderate-sized octavo pages"; but it seems a little absurd to complain until the experiment has proved successful that a book which is expected to contain all the statutory provisions set out at length, and a statement of, or reference to all the cases and authorities in a large and expensive book. But the extensive nature of the subject ought to render the editor doubly zealous in condensing his matter as far as possible, and excluding everything which could be considered as coming under the category of "padding." This, we regret to say, Mr. Prentice has not done. He has also manifested a reverence for the notes of his predecessor, Mr. Greaves, Q.C., which we do not share. Many instances might be given of this; but the most curious we have met with is the retention of that learned gentleman's note on *R. v. Harris* (Dears. C. C. 344), notwithstanding that in *R. v. Cullum* (21 W. R. 687), Blackburn, J., distinctly pronounced it wrong, and the court refused to adopt Mr. Greaves' view. Yet the note is reprinted with the addition, "but see *R. v. Cullum*, 12 Cox C. C. 469, ante, p. 338, where Mr. Greaves' note was referred to, but not followed."

Cases of the Week.

PROMOTER OF COMPANY—SALE OF PROPERTY TO COMPANY—FIDUCIARY RELATION—OBIGATION TO DISCLOSE INTEREST.—On the 27th ult. the Court of Appeal (Jesse, M.R., James, L.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) reversed the decision of Malins, V.C., in *The New Sombrero Phosphate Company v. Erlanger* (25 W. R. 18). The facts were briefly as follows:—The property of a company in liquidation was offered for sale by the liquidator. A number of persons formed themselves into a "syndicate" for the purpose of purchasing it, with the view of afterwards selling to a new company to be formed. In the name of a trustee for themselves they bought the property from the liquidator for £55,000. The agreement for purchase was made on the 30th of August, and confirmed by the court in the winding up on the 15th of September. The principal member of the syndicate, the nominal purchaser, and the solicitor of the syndicate formed the new company, and registered the memorandum and articles of association on the 29th of September, and on the same day a provisional agreement was entered into by the nominal purchaser to sell the property to a trustee for the new company for £110,000. Soon afterwards a prospectus of the new company was issued, which gave the names of five persons as directors, and stated that a provisional contract for the purchase of the property had been approved by the directors, giving the name of the nominal purchaser from the liquidator as the sole vendor to the company. Two of the five persons mentioned in the prospectus as directors were absent from England, and had not acted; the other three had approved the contract, but of these, one was the nominal purchaser from the liquidator, and he was a mere agent of the principal member of the syndicate, and another had his qualification found for him by the principal member. The third was the only independent director, he having paid for his shares in the company, but he was ignorant that the syndicate promoting the new company were the real vendors of the property, and ignorant also of the fact that the property was being sold for double the price which had just been given for it. The same solicitor acted both for the syndicate and the new company. A few months after the formation of the company the facts relating to the purchase were discovered by the shareholders, and a bill was then filed by the company against the members of the syndicate, asking to have the contract for purchase of the property rescinded. The Vice-Chancellor held that the syndicate stood in a perfectly independent position towards the company, and

were entitled to make whatever profit they could out of the transaction. The Court of Appeal, on the contrary, held that the syndicate were the promoters of the company, and that in that character they stood in a fiduciary relation to the company, and were bound to make a full disclosure to them of all the circumstances, and particularly of the fact that they were the vendors of the property and of the price which they had just given for it. The contract for sale to the new company was not really sanctioned by any independent person on behalf of the company, and was in truth a mere sham. If the persons who were invited to take shares in the company had had full knowledge of all the facts, that might have amounted to sufficient confirmation so as to prevent the company from setting aside the contract; but this was not the case. The court, therefore, held that the contract must be rescinded, and decreed that the defendants should repay the purchase-money to the company. James, L.J., said that he fully adhered to what he said in *Gover's case* (24 W. R. 125, L. R. 1 Ch. D. 132), that a person who sells property to a joint stock company is entitled, like any other vendor, to obtain what price he can for it, and is under no obligation to disclose the price which he gave for it. But in that case his lordship held that the person whose conduct was in question was not a promoter of the company, and therefore what he then said had no application to the present case. One of the objections urged to the suit was that the company had been, as its memorandum of association stated, formed for the express purpose of acquiring the property purchased from the defendants, and therefore it was contended that the company could not maintain a suit to rescind the contract for the acquisition of this property, but that the proper remedy would be by an action for damages against the directors. The court, however, held, not only that the company were entitled to maintain the suit, but that they were, in fact, the only proper plaintiffs, the contract being one to which they were a party.

MORTGAGE—PURCHASE OF EQUITY OF REDEMPTION BY FIRST MORTGAGEE—EXTINGUISHMENT OF MORTGAGE DEBT.—On the 28th of February the Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., James, L.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) affirmed the decision of Hall, V.C., in *Adams v. Angell* (25 W. R. 139). The decision is of importance as showing the view which the court takes of the rule laid down by such cases as *Toulmin v. Steere* (3 Mer. 210) that a first mortgagee who purchases from the mortgagor the equity of redemption of the mortgaged property, having even only constructive notice of the existence of a second mortgage, will, in the absence of any indication of an intention to keep alive the first mortgage debt, be presumed to have extinguished it, so as to put the second mortgagee in the position of first incumbrancer on the estate. In *Adams v. Angell*, the first mortgagee instituted a foreclosure suit against the mortgagor and the second mortgagee, and in November, 1874, the ordinary foreclosure decree was made. In June, 1875, the mortgagor was adjudicated a bankrupt, and the suit was afterwards revived against the trustee in the bankruptcy. The plaintiff entered into an agreement with the trustee for the purchase of the equity of redemption in the mortgaged property, and it was conveyed to him by a deed dated the 17th of March, 1876. The recitals in this deed stated that £1,380 was due to the plaintiff on his mortgage; that the trustee had contracted for the absolute sale to the plaintiff (*subject to the claim of the second mortgagee*) of the mortgaged property for £1,400, and that it had been agreed that the £1,380 should be retained by the plaintiff out of the purchase-money. The operative part of the deed conveyed the property in consideration of the £1,380 retained by the plaintiff, *in full satisfaction* of the mortgage debt (the plaintiff declaring it to be fully satisfied accordingly), and in consideration of £20 paid by the plaintiff to the trustee, and the property was conveyed *subject to the claim of the second mortgagee*. After this deed was executed an order was made in the suit on the plaintiff's application, the second mortgagee consenting, that all further proceedings should be stayed as against the mortgagor and his trustee. The second mortgagee afterwards insisted that the effect of the deed was to extinguish the plaintiff's mortgage debt, and to make him (the second mortgagee) the first incumbrancer on the property, and in support of this contention reliance was placed on *Toulmin v. Steere*, and on those words in the

deed which we have placed in italics. The Vice-Chancellor held, and the Court of Appeal were of opinion that he was right in holding, that *Toulmin v. Steere*, though judges have often expressed disapproval of it, had stood so long that it must be treated as a binding authority by a court of first instance. But the Vice-Chancellor held that the facts of *Adams v. Angell* distinguished it from *Toulmin v. Steere*, and that it could not be presumed that there was any intention that the plaintiff's charge on the property should be destroyed, and this view was adopted by the Court of Appeal. They thought it unnecessary to decide whether *Toulmin v. Steere* was or was not binding on the intermediate Court of Appeal, or whether it could only be overruled by the House of Lords; but they were clear that its doctrine ought not to be extended, but ought to be strictly confined to a case of the same kind. The question, they said, was really one of intention, as manifested either expressly or from the surrounding circumstances. For instance, if a tenant for life paid off a charge on the estate, the court always presumed, in the absence of any declared intention, that it was his intention to keep it alive for his own benefit, because it was obviously for his benefit to do so. On the contrary, if a tenant in tail paid off the charge, the presumption was the other way. In *Adams v. Angell*, by reason of the mortgagor's bankruptcy, the mortgage debts were put an end to as debts of the bankrupt, and there remained only a succession of charges on the estate. The mortgage security being insufficient, it was clear that the trustee would never redeem, because it would have been a breach of trust on his part to do so. Indeed, as James, L.J., said, if a trustee in bankruptcy were, out of the bankrupt's assets, to pay off a first mortgage on property of the bankrupt, he would evidently be doing it for the benefit of the bankrupt's general estate, and it would be impossible to hold that by so doing he had let in subsequent mortgagees in priority to himself. And a purchaser from the trustee must be in the same position as the trustee himself would have been. Moreover, the foreclosure decree having been made, its effect was to declare the plaintiff to be the first mortgagee and to foreclose the second mortgagee unless he redeemed the first mortgagee; and it would be absurd to suppose that the first mortgagee, having obtained this benefit by the decree, intended, by the subsequent purchase of the equity of redemption, to surrender it for nothing to the second mortgagee. And the conveyance itself was not made subject to the charge of the second mortgagee, but only *subject to his claim*, his claim being nothing more than a right to redeem the first mortgage, upon paying him his principal, interest, and costs. There was therefore abundant evidence to show that there was no intention on the plaintiff's part to extinguish the first charge, and the operation of the doctrine of *Toulmin v. Steere* was excluded.

TIME FOR APPEALING—BANKRUPTCY APPEAL—ORD. 58, rr. 2, 9, 15; ORD. 57, rr. 2, 3—BANKRUPTCY RULES, 1870, n. 143—BANKRUPTCY ORD., MAY 26, 1873.—A question as to the time within which appeals from orders made by the Court of Bankruptcy must be brought to the Court of Appeal was raised in two cases which came before the Court of Appeal on the 1st inst., and from what took place it is evident that some misapprehension very generally prevails as to the effect of the orders under the Judicature Act, notwithstanding what was said by the court in the case of *In re Tellwright* (noted 20 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, p. 501). R. 143 of the Bankruptcy Rules, 1870, provides that an appeal against a decision of the Chief Judge or a judge of a county court shall be entered with the registrar of appeals within, and not later than, twenty-one days from the decision. This has always been construed to mean within twenty-one days from the pronouncing of the order, not from the date of its being signed (*Ex parte Hinton*, 23 W. R. 488, L. R. 19 Eq. 266). But it was held by the Chief Judge in *Ex parte Hicks* (23 W. R. 852, L. R. 20 Eq. 143), on the construction of the Bankruptcy Rule of the 26th of May, 1873, that Sundays are not to be reckoned in computing the twenty-one days, and the Court of Appeal assented to this view in *In re Partridge* (noted 20 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, p. 504). So matters stood prior to the Judicature Acts. The Act

of 1875, by section 18, provides that "all rules and orders of court in force at the time of the commencement of the Act . . . in relation to appeals from the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy, . . . except so far as they are expressly varied by the first schedule hereto, or by rules of court made by Order in Council before the commencement of this Act, shall remain and be in force . . . in the Court of Appeal" until they shall be annulled by new rules. Then ord. 58, r. 2, provides that all appeals to the Court of Appeal shall be brought by notice of motion, which, by r. 3, is to be served on all parties affected by the appeal. R. 9 provides that the time for appealing from any order or decision made in the matter of any bankruptcy shall be the same as the time limited for appeal from an interlocutory order under r. 15, and r. 15 provides that no appeal from an interlocutory order shall (except by special leave of the Court of Appeal) be brought after the expiration of twenty-one days, but the twenty-one days are to be calculated from the time at which the order is signed, entered, or otherwise perfected, or, in the case of the refusal of an application, from the date of the refusal. And ord. 57, r. 2, provides that Sundays are not to be excluded from the computation of time, except where the time limited for doing any act is less than six days. In *In re Lewer*, the first of the two cases to which we refer, the order appealed from was pronounced by the Chief Judge on the 13th of November, and by it he allowed an appeal from a county court. The order was not signed until the 30th of November; the notice of appeal was given on the 16th of December. It was objected that the appeal was too late, and it was contended that the practice was still regulated by the Bankruptcy Rules of 1870. But the court (Jessel, M.R., James, L.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) held, as was held in *In re Tellwright*, that r. 143 has been expressly varied by ord. 58, rr. 9 and 15, and that the twenty-one days must be calculated from the signing of the order. The appeal was therefore in time. In the other case, *In re Gilbert*, an order refusing an application was pronounced by one of the registrars on the 29th of November. Notice of appeal was served on the respondent on the 23rd of December, the appeal having been entered with the registrar on the 22nd of December. The objection was taken that the appeal was too late. In answer it was urged that the practice in bankruptcy by which Sundays were excluded from the computation of the time remained unaltered by the orders under the Judicature Act, and it was further contended that the date of entry of the appeal was the material date, not the date of the service of the notice of appeal, and it was stated that the appellant's solicitor had made inquiries at the office of the registrar of appeals, and had been informed that Sundays were not included in the computation of the time. The court, however, were clearly of opinion that the appeal was out of time, and said that the practice was now entirely regulated by the orders under the Judicature Acts. The Sundays were not excluded from the computation, and the material date was the date of service of notice of motion of appeal. Till that had been served there was no appeal. And the court refused an application to extend the time founded on the allegation that the appellant's solicitor had been misled by what he was told at the registrar's office.

COMPOSITION—DEFAULT IN PAYMENT—ACTION BY CREDITOR FOR ORIGINAL DEBT—INJUNCTION.—In another case of *In re Lopez*, heard on the same day, the Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., James, L.J., and Baggallay, J.A.) appear to have to some extent modified the rule which had been laid down with regard to the exercise of the discretion of the court in restraining an action brought by a creditor of a debtor, whose creditors have agreed to accept a composition, for the full amount of his original debt. The rule as established by the cases of *Ex parte Paper Staining Company* (L. R. 8 Ch. 595), *Ex parte Hartell* (21 W. R. 428, L. R. 8 Ch. 743), and *Ex parte Watson* (24 W. R. 592, L. R. 2 Ch. D. 68) was understood to be that where the question in dispute was one which was common to all the creditors—where, for instance, it went to the root of the validity of the composition—the court would restrain the creditor from proceeding with his action, so that the matter might be litigated once for all in the Court of Bankruptcy; but that, where the question was one which affected only the debtor and the particular creditor, the court would not interfere, but would allow the action to proceed. In *In re Lopez* the court expressed an opinion that, even in a case where the question affects only the debtor and the particular creditor, the action ought not to be allowed to proceed if the court could see that there was no substance in it, it being the duty of the Court of Bankruptcy to prevent a debtor from being harassed by merely vexatious actions. In *In re Lopez* the court thought that there was a question of substance to be tried, and that the creditor was entitled to have it decided by the highest tribunal, and, therefore, they refused to restrain the action.

SERVICE OUT OF JURISDICTION—MOTION TO DISCHARGE—CONDITIONAL APPEARANCE—PROPERTY "WITHIN THE JURISDICTION"—DISCRETION OF JUDGE—ORD. 11, RR. 1, 1A.

—On the 1st inst. *Hastings*, Q.C., and *Yate Lee* moved to discharge an order for service of the writ of summons in *Mackenzie v. Shepherd* on the defendant Henderson out of the jurisdiction. The defendant Henderson had not appeared, and *Hastings*, Q.C., suggested that a conditional appearance for him should be entered by the registrar in court to enable the motion to be brought on. Hall, V.C., acceded to this view, and the motion then proceeded. The action was instituted by Mrs. Mackenzie to have a trust deed, by way of voluntary settlement, made by her in Edinburgh, and in Scotch form, set aside on the ground of fraud. The deed was prepared and executed in Scotland, and the plaintiff was, at the time of execution, a domiciled Scotchwoman. The defendant Henderson, who was one of the trustees, was a domiciled Scotchman, and a solicitor of the Supreme Court of Scotland, resident in Edinburgh; and the other trustee was a Scotchman by birth, now resident at Cognac, in France, where he carried on business as a brandy merchant. He also had a place of business in London. The plaintiff and her husband had lived in London since their marriage, but the husband was an infant, and it was uncertain whether his father (who was dead) was a domiciled Englishman or not. On the 11th of January the plaintiff obtained leave to serve the writ on the defendant Henderson out of the jurisdiction, on the ground that part of the property comprised in the settlement was property within the jurisdiction, being debenture bonds of the Otago and Southland Investment Company (Limited), having its registered office, and carrying on business, in London. It may also be stated that shares in certain railways, partly in England and partly in Scotland, but whose head offices were in Scotland, were subject to the trusts of the settlement. It was urged on behalf of the defendant Henderson that the whole subject-matter of the action was essentially Scotch, and the elements necessary to give the court discretion under ord. 11 were wanting. In the alternative the defendant contended that, even assuming the court to have such discretion, the present was not a proper case for its exercise under ord. 11, r. 1a; and the balance of convenience was in favour of Scotland. The Otago bonds were in the possession of Henderson, in Scotland, and none of the parties were resident in England except the plaintiff and her husband, while all the material witnesses of the defendant resided in Scotland, and one of these was so old and infirm as to be unable to travel to London. *Dickinson*, Q.C., and *Everitt*, for the plaintiff, contended that the order was technically correct, under the first part of ord. 11, r. 1, and that the discretion mentioned in r. 1a applied only to cases covered by the latter portion of r. 1, where there was no property within the jurisdiction. They cited *Phosphate-Guano Company v. Guild* (L. R. 17 Eq. 432), and the remarks of Lord Blackburn in *Mayor of London v. Cox* (L. R. 2 H. 239). Those remarks showed that a defendant would not be allowed to choose the *forum* where he should be sued, so as to gain the advantage of having the case decided where (as here) the law would be most favourable to him. The settlement was certainly invalid by English law; but Scotch law might uphold it. *O. Morgan*, Q.C., and *Angelo J. Lewis*, appeared for the husband to support the order, but the Vice-Chancellor held they had no *locus standi*. Hall, V.C., said that possibly the order might have been within ord. 11, r. 1; but he thought he could not have seen the settlement when he made the order. Substantially the action was one to set aside a Scotch settlement made by persons resident in Scotland, and even if it were to proceed here he would require the

assistance of a Scotch court and would have to send a case for trial in Scotland. The balance of convenience was against a trial in London, for the plaintiff could easily go down to Scotland, while there would be great difficulty in bringing all the witnesses up here. The order must be discharged.

General Correspondence.

* * * "OBSERVER."—Next week.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—The recent annual circulation of the report of this association for the past year has brought the following letter to me from a benevolent correspondent.

May I ask you to be good enough, in the interest of this association, to give his suggestion the publicity of your columns this week?

THOMAS EIFFE, Secy.

9, Clifford's-inn, E.C., March 1.

[The following is the letter referred to by our correspondent:—

London, March 1, 1877.

Sir,—You will know from the accompanying card whence this comes, and that is from a life member and (since 1868) an annual subscriber of the modest guineas.

I verily believe that there are many who would, if asked, become life members as well as annual subscribers. I also think that there are many who are life members and not annual subscribers who would, if asked, become annual subscribers.

Again, there are some life members who would (seeing the date of their subscription as life members) begin *de novo*. There is to be a festival in June. Would not this be an excellent opportunity for a special effort? If twenty annual subscribers will become life members as well, or if twenty life members will become *de novo* life members, i.e., if £200 is raised by such means before the 6th of June, I will promise £10 10s. further as a life member *de novo* in addition.—Yours faithfully,

B. P. A.

The Secretary, Solicitors' Benevolent Association.]

THE RESPITE OF FREDERIC TREADAWAY.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—The papers of Monday last announced that her Majesty had been advised to respire the capital sentence passed upon Frederic Treadaway, on the ground that he was insane when he killed Mr. Collins.

At the trial several witnesses spoke to the existence of insanity in the prisoner's family; no less than five medical men (some of them of acknowledged eminence) were examined on behalf of the accused; and both in the speeches of Mr. Besley and in the judge's summing up the law as it might have told in Treadaway's favour was fully laid before the jury. In passing sentence, Mr. Justice Lush said that, "after giving anxious and careful attention to the evidence, the jury had come to a conclusion in which he entirely concurred."

Under these circumstances a respite seems a dangerous, if not an unconstitutional, stretch of the prerogative, and is probably dictated by a dislike for capital punishment where the courage to obtain an alteration in the law is wanting.

If Treadaway was insane when he shot Mr. Collins, on what principle is he to be punished at all? and how soon, after being convicted of murder by a jury with all the facts before them, is Treadaway to be at large?

THOS. CAVE, JUNR.

City Liberal Club, Queen-street, E.C., March 1.

A memorandum by the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records, approved by the Master of the Rolls, has been issued, recommending the destruction of a large mass of legal and Government documents of no possible present or future use or interest, and which only serve to cumber the shelves of the Record Office.

COUNTY COURT PLAINTS AND COMMITMENTS.

MR. BASS has obtained for the House of Commons a return showing the total number of the plaints entered in the various county courts in England during the year 1875, and also of the persons imprisoned by order of the courts during the same period, and it is satisfactory to observe that while the number of the first has increased that of the latter has diminished.

The entry of plaints, which diminished from 900,767 in 1872 to 864,707 in 1873, rose once more to 864,790 in 1874, and 877,450 in 1875. The number of plaints are divided into four classes, namely, those for sums exceeding 40s., those between 5s. and 40s., those between 1s. and 5s., and those for sums not exceeding 1s., and it is noticeable that while the plaints for debts exceeding 40s. have steadily increased since 1873, those in the other three classes have as steadily diminished. The proportion per 1,000 of plaints in each class during the year appears to have been—over 40s., 379, between 5s. and 40s., 557, between 1s. and 5s., 63, and not exceeding 1s. only 1. It may be added that for the last five years the largest proportion of plaints (among the above four classes) has been made up of claims for sums varying from 1s. to 5s.

The county court circuit which presents the largest entry of plaints during 1875 is circuit No. 14 (comprising Leeds and other large manufacturing towns), which shows a total of 38,080, and this is followed by circuit No. 21 (Atherstone, Birmingham, and Tamworth), with 36,223 entries. As regards particular courts, Birmingham heads the list with 35,046 plaints, and next come Liverpool with 24,536 and Sheffield with 20,961. In each of the circuits and districts named the largest proportion of entries was for debts varying from 5s. to 40s. The business of the circuit was lightest in No. 28 (Mid-Wales), with 6,531 entries, and Belford (in circuit No. 1) was the court with the smallest number of plaints, only 21 having been entered there during the whole year.

The other branch of the report relates to the number of debtors actually imprisoned. The total imprisonments in England have steadily fallen from 6,993 in 1872 to 5,279 in 1873, 4,438 in 1874, and 4,163 in 1875. As regards the amounts "in respect of which default was made," the proportion per 1,000 was as follows:—487 for sums over 40s., 508 between 5s. and 40s., and 5 between 1s. and 5s. We observe that in the district of the Romford Court a debtor was committed for a debt not exceeding 1s., but we do not learn from the statistics the length of the imprisonment which he experienced. As in former years, the largest proportion of imprisonments is for sums varying between 5s. and 40s.; but these figures doubtless refer to the unpaid instalment, and not to the whole sum recovered under the judgment. The largest number of prisoners were committed by the judge of circuit No. 7 (comprising Warrington, Wigan, and other large manufacturing towns), where the total reached 373; while in circuit No. 59 (Cornwall) there were only 8, and in circuit No. 57 (North Devon and West Somerset) only 5. In many districts there was not a single imprisonment; but on the other hand, in 4 courts the number of prisoners exceeded 100, there having been 109 at Bristol, 115 at Birmingham, 150 at Leicester, and 152 at Leeds.

A parliamentary return states that in the two years 1874 and 1875 the Queen's Proctor "intervened" in twenty-four divorce suits. In fourteen, or more than half, the intervention was successful; in eight it proved unsuccessful. In the other two suits the Queen's Proctor withdrew from the suit, under the directions of the Attorney-General, before the hearing of the issues raised by the intervention.

A telegram states that, in a question which came before the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia on Saturday, evidence was adduced to the effect that the seal attached to certain commissions was not the Great Seal of the province, but the old seal which was ordered to be returned to the Imperial Government in 1869. The Premier, who was examined, admitted that the Government had been using the old seal, and the court expressed its opinion that all Acts requiring the Great Seal since 1869 were totally void.

THE BLOCK IN CHANCERY.

On Friday, the 23rd ult., Mr. OSBOURNE MORGAN called attention in the House of Commons "to the great and increasing delays which had occurred in the administration of justice," and moved that such delays could only be obviated "by an increase in the strength of the judicial and administrative departments of the High Court of Justice, proportioned to the increased work imposed upon them." He said that whatever differences might exist as to the resolution which he had placed upon the paper, no one could doubt that the time had arrived when we might fairly and usefully review the operation of the Judicature Acts. Those Acts had been in operation nearly a year and a half, as legal years went, and it was not, therefore, too soon to take stock of their operation, and see how far the predictions which had been indulged in, when they were under discussion, had or had not been realized. Now he was bound to say that in one respect the working of the Acts had very agreeably disappointed public expectation. It was said that the judges could not safely be trusted to administer the new system until they had been educated up to its level. As far as his experience went no prediction could have been more unfounded. The judges had set to work honestly and loyally to carry out the new Acts, both in the letter and in the spirit, both in the rules which they had framed and in the mode in which they construed those rules and the Acts themselves; and the consequence was that the new system had worked far better and more smoothly than any one could have anticipated. How, then, it might be asked, was it that every one was complaining already of the break down of the Judicature Acts? That was a question which he would endeavour to answer before he sat down. Now some of his honourable friends might remember that, when the Acts were under discussion, he had pointed out that the result of improving their judicial system in the way they proposed to do would be to attract to the courts business which had never found its way there before, and, if that were so, was it not to be expected that our existing machinery, which had been found barely sufficient for our existing wants, would break down under the additional strain thus imposed upon it? That apprehension was founded upon an assumption, no doubt paradoxical in itself, but which was abundantly justified by experience, namely, that up to a certain point the result of every improvement in the administration of justice was, not to diminish, but increase litigation. The fact was—humiliating as it was to admit it—that there were until very lately in England thousands of persons who deliberately consented to have their pockets picked simply because they were more afraid of the law than of the law breaker. And really when he looked back at reports of cases decided some twenty or thirty years ago, and saw how the ingenuity of judges and counsel was strained to muddle away the merits of a case—how every importance was attributed to technicalities of pleading and practice, and none whatever to the right and justice of the case, he could scarcely wonder that a man, having to choose between injustice and that sort of justice, should deliberately come to the conclusion that, upon the whole, injustice was the lesser evil of the two. But they had changed all that. It was scarcely too much to say that recent reforms had made our judicial system, once the most technical and artificial in the world, one of the most simple and certain. For the first time in its history a suitor might feel confident that he would not be turned out of the Temple of Justice because he had got in by the wrong door, and that, if his case had any "merits," those merits would not be overlooked, and the result might be seen in the increase of business to which he had called attention. Now he was far from thinking that such an increase was matter for unmixed regret. On the contrary, he thought that, so far as it showed that the public were beginning to put more confidence in the administration of justice, it was matter for congratulation. But before coming to figures, he wished to advert to another circumstance which had helped to aggravate the existing block of business in one important branch of the High Court. Before the passing of the Judicature Acts cases in the Court of Chancery were usually decided on affidavit evidence. Now he knew of no more ingenious process for not getting at the truth of a case than this system of affidavit evidence. But it had one great advantage. It materially shortened the hearing of a case, for a practised eye could easily separate the relevant from the irrelevant parts of an affidavit, whereas such

a process of elimination became much more difficult when the truth had to be extracted, bit by bit, from a stupid or unwilling or dishonest witness. Now the Judicature Acts had provided that the evidence should be taken, as a rule, *viva voce* in all the courts. But this change, which in the interests of truth was much to be commended, had been purchased at a considerable sacrifice of time, and the result had been that in the Chancery Division they had not only more cases to try, but they occupied a longer time in trying them. What was the state of things in the Chancery Division? Before the Judicature Act came into operation the average number of cases waiting for hearing in the four courts of the Master of the Rolls and the three Vice-Chancellors at the beginning of each term was 300. At the beginning of the year 1875 it was 301. At the beginning of this year, when the Acts had been in operation a year and a quarter, the number had risen to 566, and the day before yesterday it was 698. But what was most significant was the gradual and progressive increase in these numbers. At the beginning of last year it was only 332, at Easter it had risen to 457, in June to 502, at Christmas to 566, and now it was 698. Well, but were these cases lighter? On the contrary, from a cause to which he had already referred, they were much heavier, and the strength of the judges, instead of being increased, was actually lessened, for under the old system the Lord Chancellor and the Lords Justices of Appeal were members of the Court of Chancery, and one of those learned judges could, and very often did, sit with great effect to hear cases set down before judges of the first instance. But this was no longer possible, for now the Appeal Court formed a distinct tribunal. Indeed, the case was now reversed, for one of the four chancery judges, the Master of the Rolls, was now a member of the Appeal Court, and was actually sitting in that court at this moment, his own court being, of course, shut up. So that instead of, as before, borrowing a judge from the Appeal Court, the Chancery Division might be required to lend a judge to that court. Now, let him ask this question. For the last ten years before the Judicature Acts the average number of causes and matters originating every year in the Court of Chancery had been 2,500. Last year it was 5,111. Now, if four judges and their staffs were barely sufficient to dispose of 2,500 cases, how could less than four judges and their staffs be expected satisfactorily to dispose of 5,111? So that what they were attempting to do was, in fact, to put a quart of water into a pint pot, and that was a process which could not be satisfactorily accomplished even by Act of Parliament. They had all heard of the unfortunate damsels who, for sins done in the flesh, were condemned in another world to fill a tub which leaked as fast as it was filled, but he thought the task imposed upon their judicial Danaides was at least as cruel; for they were required to empty a tub which filled twice as quickly as they could empty it. But how did all this work in practice, for that was what the House would wish to hear? Why simply this. The Vice-Chancellors were at this moment hearing cases which were set down for hearing eight, ten, and twelve months ago. Here was a letter written to him by a friend, in whose testimony he could confide, which gave a picture by no means exaggerated of a state of things which must be seen to be believed:—"I have a case in your own court which has been waiting for hearing ever since March or April last, and it is still quite impossible to say when it will be reached. It only involves a short point of construction, and will not take half an hour when it comes on, but the parties will have had to wait almost or quite a year for this half-hour of judicial time. In the meantime, it is impossible to administer real and personal property of considerable amount, to the very great inconvenience of all concerned. Law taxes may be as bad in principle as Bentham contended, but most suitors would find them a lesser evil than the present delay." Well, but suppose "this half-hour of judicial time" secured at last and a decision pronounced, there was still the registrar's office to be passed, where a further delay of a month or six weeks took place, and then, if accounts had to be taken, came the most trying delay of all, that in the judge's chambers. He was told that it took at least a fortnight to get an appointment before the chief clerk, even for the most ordinary

nary purpose. Let him read a letter received by an eminent firm of solicitors practising in the county represented by his hon. and learned friend opposite (Mr. Gregory) from their London agents respecting a case in their office. It was dated the 14th of January, 1877:—"The order on further consideration made in May last has only within the last three weeks been obtained from the registrar. The share in which Mrs. S. is interested is directed to be carried over to a separate account, with liberty to any party interested to apply. But before this can be done the costs must be taxed, the whole fund arranged, and the inquiry No. 2 answered. The contest with Mr. S.'s assignee will then have to be gone through. At the present time it certainly appears to us that at least a year must elapse before Mrs. S. can touch a single penny of the fund." And this in a country in which time was supposed to be money! Why, half the rascals in England would soon be presuming on this state of things to resist any just claim that might be made against them. Only that morning a man had told him that he had been compelled to abate £500 of a claim to which he was as justly entitled as he (Mr. Morgan) was to his seat in that House, because he would have had to have waited two or three years before he could have established it, and the delay would have been ruin to him and his family. After discussing the various remedies proposed, Mr. Morgan continued:—"Against the proposal to increase the judicial staff two arguments, and two only, had been urged. It had been said, first, that if we had more judges we should have to put up with inferior men on the bench; and, secondly, that the country would not stand the expense. As to the first argument, he felt it very difficult to treat it seriously. He had hitherto understood that when a vacancy arose in the judicial bench the difficulty in filling it up arose rather from the number, than from the paucity, of the competitors for it; and he had even heard it whispered occasionally that there were times when the bar was showing itself too strong for the bench. As for the other argument, it no doubt was entitled to some weight, particularly from a member of a party which had made retrenchment one of its watchwords. The salary of a judge was £5,000 a year, and, looking to the value of the article, he could hardly say it was dear at the price. At any rate, he much questioned whether it would be politic to reduce it. Now, it was said that each new Vice-Chancellor, with his staff of chief clerks and registrars, would involve the country in an outlay of twice or perhaps thrice that amount. Granting, however, for a moment that the argument was a sound one in itself, he had an answer to it. It was founded on a mistake of fact. Astonishing as it might seem, it was the fact that the judges in the Chancery Division were, to a great extent, if not entirely, self-supporting. For on adding up the fees taken in the offices of the Chancery Court for the year ending October, 1875, he found that they came to the enormous sum of £119,639. Making a liberal reduction for the fees earned by the Appeal Court (which were not distinguished in the estimates), he might safely assume that at least £90,000 was, in 1875, earned by the four judges of first instance and their attendant staffs. Now, the estimates for 1876 had not yet been published, but looking to the immense increase in the orders made—1,600 in one year—it was only fair to assume that those figures would be raised to at least £100,000. Dividing this sum between the Master of the Rolls and the three Vice-Chancellors, it would give £25,000 as the amount yearly earned by each judge and his staff. But the most exaggerated estimate of the cost of a new judge which he had yet seen put it at £20,000, so that as it was only fair to assume (looking to the enormous amount of work waiting to be done) that a new Vice-Chancellor would have at least as much to do as his colleagues, an additional chancery judge would not only pay his way, but would be a source of revenue to the country. He really was ashamed to urge such an argument. He thoroughly agreed with old Jeremy Bentham that the administration of justice—civil as well as criminal—was the business of the whole commonwealth, and that you had no more right to make a suitor, except as a member of the community, pay for the judge who was to hear his case than you had a right to put a special tax on the householder in order to pay for the

policeman who guarded his street, and he would not have urged such a consideration at all if it had not been from a very remarkable and, as he thought, very unfortunate speech made by no less a man than his right honourable friend the member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) two years ago, in which he had charged the members of the legal profession who were agitating for additional judges "with making an assault upon the public purse." It might be some consolation to the right hon. gentleman to know that, so far from proposing "to make an assault upon the public purse," he was endeavouring to put money into the pockets of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Unfortunately, the right hon. gentleman had no practical experience of such matters. He had never been a suitor himself, and it was astonishing to see the unanimity with which we bore the misfortunes of others. "He jests at scars who never felt a wound." Sydney Smith once said that railways would never be made safe until they had killed a bishop, and on the same principle it might be difficult to get the House to give to this question of the "law's delay" the attention it deserved until some prominent member of the front benches had learnt by practical experience what it meant. He knew that the subject was not altogether a popular one. Indeed, the moment a lawyer got up to propose any addition to the judicial staff he was always credited with having some personal end in view. He appealed, however, to his learned friends around him not to be deterred by the fear of any such imputations from speaking their minds. He appealed still more to the lay members of the House, particularly to those who were engaged in trade or commerce, to make the subject their own. For it was not a lawyer's question; it was a suitor's question, a merchant's question, a banker's question; in fact, it was a national question. Let them look the evil in the face. To deny it was impossible; to remedy it was, in his opinion, both easy and simple. If they approved of the remedy which he suggested, let them second his efforts. If they disapproved of it, in heaven's name let them at least propose something better.

Mr. MARTEN, who had given notice of his intention to move an amendment on the resolution of the hon. and learned member who had just sat down, pointed out that, in the course of the discussions on the different Judicature Bills, the Government had at first consented to increase the number of the judges, but that afterwards they yielded to the great pressure that had been brought to bear upon them, and had decided against any increase in their number being made. The number of judges of first instance in the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice was only four, whereas there was business enough for seven. The increase in the number of causes in that division since the Judicature Act came into operation had amounted to about seventy-five per cent., there being now an average of about 140 causes before each of the four judges, whereas before that Act was passed the average number was only eighty-four. With a view to facilitate the transaction of business in the High Court of Justice, he suggested that the office of Chief Judge in Bankruptcy should be separated from the office of Vice-Chancellor; that the business of winding up companies should be transferred to the Court of Bankruptcy; and that an additional judge of the Chancery Division should be appointed, who should take business set down before the Master of the Rolls, such additional judge to act as Chief Judge in Bankruptcy until a separate judge in bankruptcy was appointed. He also suggested that a moderate fee for hearing before the official referees should be substituted for the present high rate of fees, so as to allow of full advantage being obtained by the public of the institution, under recent legislation, of official referees; and that the jurisdiction of the county courts should be extended, so that the limit of pecuniary amount might be the same in common law as in equity. With regard to criminal business he would suggest that the principle of the constitution of the Central Criminal Court should be applied throughout England and Wales, and that criminal business requiring the presence of a judge of the High Court of Justice should be taken in connection with the local quarter sessions, and that a revision should be made of the classes of cases proper to be tried before judges of the High Court of Justice, and before the court of quarter sessions respectively, so that only the gravest cases might be reserved for trial before the judges of the

High Court. Then, with respect to the civil business on circuit, he would suggest that there should be one list of cases for the circuit, each case entered being marked on the list for the place where the trial was desired, the judge of the High Court proceeding from place to place as the amount of the business at each place permitted, and that commission days for civil business should be abolished. Such a system could be easily and conveniently worked out in these days of railway and telegraphic communication. Then his concluding suggestion was that, as far as practicable, arrangements should be made for the holding of simultaneous sittings at Guildhall and at Westminster for the trial of civil cases—a course by which great advantage would be secured to the suitors and to the public.

Mr. COLE said that one cause of the recent congestion was the great tendency now to try causes in London. Under the Judicature Act all local venues had been abolished, and hence the causes were removed to London. In the judge's chambers it was impossible for counsel to be heard for three days after a cause was put down for hearing. As to the Court of Appeal the block was greater than it had ever been, and the Court of Appeal would soon be the court in Banco for all the causes tried in London and the country. What was the position of affairs in the city of London? There were only two judges who could sit in Guildhall, and owing to the length of modern causes these two judges had been engaged for several days in trying two cases. The only thing to be done in the circumstances was to strengthen the staff of judges. As to the expense, it seemed to him they would pay themselves. A distinguished chancery judge—Vice-Chancellor Hall—had said to him, "Talk of the expense of judges! Why, I am earning at the present moment double my salary by the fees that are got in my court." But even if it was otherwise, was the judicial business of the country to be stopped in order to save a few thousand pounds?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, while acknowledging that the discussion which had arisen was one of a very interesting nature, was doubtful whether it would be useful to prolong it, for it was a subject on which it seemed to him there was likely to be a very general agreement. Beyond doubt there was a great block of business, and the question was how to deal with it. His hon. and learned friend who had introduced the subject had spoken with much earnestness, but probably without exaggeration, and his statement as to the block of business in the department of the High Court with which he had more particularly to do was entirely borne out by the testimony of a very temperate memorial which had been laid before the Lord Chancellor by the Incorporated Law Society. Taking the statements of that memorial there was certainly a much greater arrear of business in the Chancery Division than formerly, and the causes had risen from an average of 2,500 during the ten years from 1864 to 1874, to 5,111 at the present time. Various causes had contributed to that increase of business. People having rights were more eager to embark in litigation than formerly. Since the Judicature Act suitors were aware that they could have their causes tried before a single judge, with the great advantage of having the evidence taken *viva voce*. There appeared to be an opinion that a great many civil causes could be better tried by a single judge, the evidence being taken *viva voce*, than before a jury. A great many causes were now taken to the Chancery Division, where the evidence could be taken *viva voce* as in the common law divisions. The Master of the Rolls, in dealing with this matter, had called these common law cases and treated them somewhat as intruders. They might be common law cases, but they came to the Chancery Division, and those who brought them had the right to have them tried there. They had to be dealt with by the tribunal before which they were brought. He was sorry to confess that there was a very considerable block in the Chancery Division, and it was difficult to know how to deal with it. The block arose, in the first place, from the want of judicial strength; and, secondly, it arose from the want of strength in the subordinate offices. He thought the suggestion made by the hon. and learned member for Cambridge was sensible and reasonable. That would give some increase of strength, and if an additional judge were appointed he might deal with those causes which had come to the Chancery Division, as assistant to the judges of

that division. It was under the consideration of the Government to increase the judicial strength in the Chancery Division. They were also earnestly considering whether some measures could not be taken to relieve the pressure of business existing in the judges' chambers in that division. It had been expected that a very considerable amount of relief would be afforded by the appointment of referees. Four gentlemen were appointed referees and cases might go to them. It had happened, however, that they had not had much work to do, and the reason might be that which was indicated by his hon. and learned friend the member for Cambridge—viz., that they were authorized to charge a certain fee per hour for sitting, and this had been distasteful, and perhaps unjust, to suitors. He had come to the conclusion that if the fees were diminished or abolished recourse would be more frequently had to the referees, and if they were not otherwise fully engaged they might be employed in getting rid of the surplus business at judges' chambers. In regard to the vacant registrarship, no doubt it would be necessary for the Lord Chancellor to fill up the appointment. The Government desired to remove the block of legal business by an increase of judicial strength if the object could not be attained otherwise; but it must be borne in mind that the system of trying cases by one judge had hardly as yet had a fair trial. The block was caused by the great arrears of *Nisi Prius* cases. A vast saving of time would be effected if shorthand writers were utilized in the *Nisi Prius* courts throughout the country as in parliamentary committees. He did not say that the Government were considering the proposal to increase the number of the judges in the common law divisions, though, of course, if, after a fair trial, the arrears were found to be still increasing, there would be nothing for it but such an addition to the number of judges. As to the suggested further alterations in the judicature system, there should first be a full trial of the present system, recently altered as it had been. At present he did not see his way to enlarging the jurisdiction of the county court judges; nor did he think it would be well that criminal jurisdiction should be subordinated to the civil jurisdiction, and that the former should be exercised by the judges of inferior dignity.

Sir G. BOWYER moved the adjournment of the debate, but the motion was negatived without a division, and the subject dropped.

MR. JOSIAH W. SMITH, Q.C., ON "THE TRUE PRINCIPLES OF JUDICIAL DECISION."

At the Hereford County Court on the 20th ult., in a case of *Barrett v. Lane*, the question was raised whether the terms of the Lodgers' Goods Protection Act had been complied with by a lodger. The learned judge (Mr. J. W. Smith, Q.C.) held that they had. Mr. Gwillim (for the defendant) said that the Lodgers Act was a most important one, and if his honour admitted it had been complied with in the present case, he should ask for leave to appeal. During the thirty years he had practised in that court he had never felt stronger on a case than he did on the present. With the greatest possible respect for his honour, he asked leave to appeal.

His Honour said he did not feel himself bound or even justified in a case in which he was clear to give any dissatisfied party the opportunity of appealing, and thereby exposing the opposite party to the expense and vexation resulting therefrom; and he was confirmed in that view more and more every year when he saw the manner in which the decisions of the High Court of Justice were week by week overruled by the Court of Appeal, and when he saw the Court of Appeal itself overruled by a higher tribunal. As long as the present system existed there would be, what he would call with all deference, this disgraceful state of things. He would read a suggested draft of "an Act for giving greater effect to the true principles of judicial decision," and he should be glad if the reporters would take those words down, because he should be very glad if they were made public throughout the length and breadth of the land. "Equally eminent judges have been and are governed by different systems or theories of judicial decision, leading to opposite results; the one mainly proceeding on technical refinements; the other on principles of natural justice, common sense, and public policy; the one deciding on general rules or principles, the other looking to the exceptive circumstances of each case as much as to

general rules or principles. The adoption of the former system by some judges has led to endless uncertainty, frequent litigation, both original and appellate, incalculable expense and vexation, and the grossest injustice and contravention of public policy. And it has been the prolific source of a mass of refined trash and learned rubbish which strains the brains, occupies the public time, and exhausts the bodily and mental powers of the judges, to no purpose but to defeat moral right and sound expediency. To remedy this truly disgraceful and mischievous state of things, what is needed is an enactment to this effect:—"Subject to any plain enactment or plain agreement to the contrary, and subject to the established rules of law, where an exception to such rules is not called for by the circumstances, all cases in litigation other than cases of construction shall, in the discretion and to the best of the judgment of the judge or judges deciding the same, be decided, so far as may be, according to justice, moral right, and public policy, and all cases of doubtful construction shall, in the discretion and to the best of the judgment of the judge or judges deciding such last-mentioned cases, be decided according to the presumable intention of the parties or testators. But the operation of this enactment shall be subject to any previous decisions of the superior courts, clearly and absolutely governing the cases in litigation, in the opinion of the judge or judges deciding such cases." That was his decided view of the subject. There was so much glorious uncertainty in the law, arising from the different modes of decision adopted by different judges, that he did not think himself justified, much less bound, to expose the party in whose favour he decided to the vexation and expense and uncertainty of a trial of the case in courts of law. When he saw a different mode of interpretation adopted he should be ready to alter his practice. As a text writer he read and analyzed all cases, and had done so for more than thirty years. As the author of divers works on jurisprudence he was more and more impressed with the necessity of something being done for a declaratory Act such as he had pointed out.

Obituary.

MR. CHARLES MORTIMER LANYON.

Mr. Charles Mortimer Lanyon, barrister, died on the 27th ult., after a short illness. Mr. Lanyon was the eldest son of Sir Charles Lanyon, C.B., of White Abbey, Belfast, formerly M.P. for Belfast. He was educated at Trinity College, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. in 1862. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1865, and joined the Home Circuit, having read as a pupil in the chambers of Mr. Thomas Chitty and of the late Sir George Honyman. He was on many occasions intrusted by the latter with the holding of briefs, and this introduction, aided by his own ability and readiness and self-possession, soon brought him into business of a good class, and within his first two years at the bar he was in receipt of an income far in excess of that of any of his contemporaries. Mr. Lanyon was counsel in many important mercantile and other cases, including *Grisell v. Bristow*, *Renkin v. Patton*, and *Nugent v. Smith*. He was one of the counsel for the plaintiff in the petition of right case of *Thomas v. The Queen*. He attended the early part of the trial up to the commencement of his illness, and the announcement of his death caused a feeling of profound sorrow among all those who were engaged in the case. Mr. Lanyon was among the most popular members of the junior bar. He was gifted with high spirits and imperturbable good humour, and his geniality and kindness endeared him to a large body of friends, who lament the premature termination of a promising career. Mr. Lanyon was a warm supporter of the Barristers' Benevolent Association, and had undertaken the collection of subscriptions from members of the South-Eastern Circuit. At the recent annual meeting of the association the chairman (Sir J. Karslake) bore testimony to the value of Mr. Lanyon's zeal and energy in the cause.

Societies.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

The usual monthly meeting of the directors was held at the Hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, on Thursday, the 1st inst., the following being present, viz., Mr. Tylee (chairman), and Messrs. Carpenter, Collison, Drew, Few, Hedger, Lovell, Masterman, Parkin, Powys, Sawtell, Scadding, Sidney Smith, Syan, Vallance, Williamson, and Boddle (secretary). To the daughter of a deceased member a grant of £35 was made, and to the sister of a deceased member one of £22 10s. One new member was elected, and the ordinary general business was transacted.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

At the weekly meeting of this society held at Clement's-in-Hall, Strand, on Wednesday, the 28th ult., the following motion was discussed:—"That the law and custom of primogeniture are contrary to public policy." The debate was opened by Mr. Thornton, who dwelt upon the hardship done to the younger children by the present law, and argued that, though the doctrine was undoubtedly necessary to the feudal system, there were no just reasons for retaining it in modern times. The motion was opposed by Mr. Owen upon the grounds that the dividing the soil into small holdings was opposed to the agricultural interests of the country; that the present method of merely portioning younger children encouraged enterprise, and that the landed gentry formed a most useful element in the Constitution. An animated debate ensued, in which a number of members joined. It was insisted that agriculture really suffered on account of the large proprietors neglecting their property, which in the hands of small owners would be carefully cultivated; that this system prevented a large body from having a stake in the country, and, while it maintained a few in luxury, was inequitable to the many. The motion was finally carried by a majority of nine. Present, thirty-five.

PLYMOUTH, STONEHOUSE, AND DEVON-PORT LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

At the meeting of this society held at the Athenaeum on Friday, February 23, an imaginary action at *Nisi Prius* was tried before the president (J. Shelley, Esq.) as judge, and a jury composed of five of the honorary and ordinary members of the society (Messrs. Wolferstan, A. Gard, Harrison, Oliver, and F. E. Bennett). The facts of the case were shortly as follows:—The plaintiff (Mr. Chubb), supposed to have been a corn merchant carrying on a large business at Gloucester, in November last obtained a contract for supplying corn at Plymouth, and started for that place on the 1st of December. Plaintiff had to travel over the lines of two railway companies, but when passing over the line of the second company the train in which he was travelling ran into a truck, which was being shunted in a station through which the train should have run without stopping. The shock knocked plaintiff down, breaking two of his ribs, and causing severe internal injuries which unfit him for business, and caused him very serious loss. The plaintiff's claim was for £2,000. Messrs. Guy and Helpman, instructed by Mr. C. Matthews, appeared for the plaintiff, and Messrs. Rickard and Pugh, instructed by Mr. Caunter, for the defendants. Plaintiff's witnesses were Messrs. Chubb (plaintiff), E. F. Fox (passenger), M. W. Phillips (who saw the accident), and McLennan (doctor). Defendants' witnesses were Messrs. Snell (engine driver), Sparrow (stoker), Jackson (guard), Prance (guard), Symons (porter), and Lane (signalman). After the summing up of the judge the jury retired to consider their verdict, which was for the plaintiff, damages £1,500. The attendance at this meeting was larger than at any previous meeting of the society, there being thirty members present, and more than seventy visitors; the trial was considered to have been a great success, and it is hoped that one may be able to be held in each session.

Appointments, &c.

Mr. ALEXANDER EDWARD MILLER, Q.C., LL.D., who has been appointed Legal Member of the Railway Commission, in the place of the late Mr. Henry Tyrwhitt Jones Macnamara, was born at Ballycastle, in the county of Antrim, on the 29th of August, 1828, and was educated at Rugby School. He afterwards went to Trinity College, Dublin, where he obtained an university scholarship in 1849, and graduated in October, 1852, as first gold medallist in mathematics and physics, and second gold medallist in classics. The senate of the university conferred on him the honorary degree of LL.D. in 1875. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1854, having in the same term obtained a studentship. He practised as an equity draftsman and conveyancer, and for some years went the Home Circuit. Mr. Miller was formerly a colleague of Mr. G. W. Hemming, Q.C., as one of the authorized reporters in the court of Vice-Chancellor Wood. He was made a Queen's Counsel in 1872, and he is a bencher of Lincoln's-inn, and an examiner in equity and the law of real property to the University of London. Mr. Miller contested (as a Conservative) the representation of the University of Dublin in 1875, but was defeated by Mr. Gibson, Q.C., now Attorney-General for Ireland.

Mr. ALFRED BARRAND BURTON, solicitor (of the firm of H. A. Burton & Scorer), of Lincoln, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Lincolnshire (Coningsby Charles Sibthorpe, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the ensuing year.

Mr. JOHN CARRINGTON CONQUEST, solicitor (of the firm of Conquest & Clare), of Bedford and Biggleswade, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Bedfordshire (Mr. Charles Magniac) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the ensuing year.

Mr. HENRY HARTLEY FOWLER, solicitor (of the firm of Corser & Fowler), of 147, Leadenhall-street, and of Wolverhampton, has been elected President of the Wolverhampton Law Association for the ensuing year.

Mr. WILLIAM GRIBBLE, solicitor and notary (of the firm of Surr, Gribble & Buntton), of 12, Abchurch-lane, and clerk to the vestry of St. John, Hampstead, has been elected Clerk to the Scriveners' Company, in succession to Mr. Park Nelson, deceased. Mr. Gribble was admitted a solicitor in 1842, and has been for many years a member of the court of assistants of the company.

Mr. PETER EDWARD HANSELL, solicitor, of Norwich and Cromer, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Norfolk (Mr. Edward Bowyer Sparke) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the ensuing year. Mr. Hansell was admitted a solicitor in 1855, and is clerk to the visiting justices of Thorpe Lunatic Asylum, and to the governors of King Edward VI's Grammar School at Norwich, also managing director of the Norwich branch of the North British and Mercantile Insurance Company.

Mr. WILLIAM WILKIN LUMB, solicitor (of the firm of Lumb & Howson), of Whitehaven, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Cumberland (Mr. Burns-Lindow) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the ensuing year. Mr. Lumb was admitted a solicitor in 1868, and is deputy-coroner for the western division of the county.

Mr. HENRY WILLIAM KENNEDY MARKHAM, solicitor, of Northampton, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Northamptonshire (John Augustus Sheil Bouvierie, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the ensuing year. Mr. Markham was admitted a solicitor in 1875.

Mr. WILLIAM MERRICK, of 6, Old Jewry, E.C., Putney-hill, S.W., and Bradford-on-Avon, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. ALBERT ST. PAUL (M.A. Oxon.), solicitor (of the firm of Fletcher, St. Paul, & Co.), of Maidenhead, Berks, and 11, Staple-inn, W.C., has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. EDMUND CRESSWELL PERLA, solicitor, of Shrewsbury, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Shropshire (Sir

H. T. Tyrwhitt, Bart.) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the ensuing year. Mr. Peele was admitted a solicitor in 1863, and is town clerk of Shrewsbury, treasurer of the county of Salop, and clerk to the county magistrates of the Church Stretton division.

Legal News.

Mr. Fawcett will on Monday ask the Attorney-General to what purposes the money realized by the recent sale of Serjeants'-inn will be devoted, and whether it is likely that any portion of it will be set apart for the encouragement of legal education.

On the 23rd ult., at the Durham Assizes, Lord Coleridge, upon an application for the costs of a prosecution for night poaching, remarked that it was the first occasion any such application had been made to him, and he hoped it would be the last, for he certainly never should order the costs in any such case. He wished it to be distinctly understood that he was only following the *dicta* of eminent judges. The law ought undoubtedly to be enforced, but, as the law protected the amusements of rich people, they must pay for its enforcement.

Many of our readers will be glad to know that the Post Office has announced a relaxation of the rule relating to the transmission of old letters by the book post. For the future old letters, or bundles of old letters—i.e., letters which have apparently passed through the post before, and have served their original purpose—will be allowed to pass by book post. And, further, copies of letters, which are so marked, or, if not so marked, are yet clearly copies, and letters which are manifestly intended for publication in a newspaper, or otherwise, may also be transmitted at the book rate of postage.

It is stated that a Turkish official has arrived in Paris deputed by the Porte to study the French judicial system. With reference to the administration of the part of this system which relates to criminal law, the Turkish official will probably find food for reflection, for the *Times* correspondent thus describes the conduct of the judge in the case of Godefroy, who was charged with murder:—"In the Godefroy case, the judge, M. Vaney, was particularly violent and insulting. He read various letters irrelevant to the case, which dis honour the whole Godefroy family. He called the accused 'hypocrite, lache, *ame vile*, &c.; in short, he has evoked public indignation by such coarse procedure, and given rise to a demand for the correction of so shocking an abuse."

In the House of Commons, on Monday last, in reply to Mr. Briggs, Mr. W. H. Smith said,—In accordance with a suggestion contained in the second report of the Legal Departments Commission, the Lords of the Treasury have communicated with the Lord Chancellor, who has concurred in the appointment of a committee of persons nominated by his lordship and the other presidents of divisions in communication with the Treasury, to consider and report as to the extent to which and the manner in which the recommendations contained in the second report of the commission can best be carried into effect, after sufficient experience of the new procedure under the Judicature Acts has afforded materials for arriving at a decision. The subjects which shall be referred to this committee are at present under consideration by the Lord Chancellor and the Treasury. The names of the persons to serve on the committee are also still matter of consideration.

On Monday last, in the House of Commons, on the vote of £40,975 for the new courts of justice and offices, Mr. Adam asked what progress had been made with the works. Mr. Gerard Noel replied that they were progressing favourably, and that, probably, a great portion of the buildings would be completed by the end of this year. Sir G. Bowyer entered a protest against the hideousness of the buildings as far as they had been erected. They contained all the defects of modern Gothic, and he never saw anything uglier. There was an enormous number of unnecessary carvings, supposed to be ornamental, but not really so, and much money might be saved by leaving them out. Mr. Charley hoped that the Government would press forward these buildings with all possible speed. Mr. Gerard Noel said the committee might depend upon it that the Government would

do all in its power to expedite the work. As to the observations of the hon. baronet, the elevation was settled, and nothing was so costly as to make alterations in a design once in progress. The vote was agreed to.

The following is a copy of the resolutions proposed by Mr. Marten, Q.C., M.P., which formed the subject of discussion in the House of Commons on Friday evening, the 23rd of February:—“With a view to facilitate the transaction of business in the High Court of Justice, it is expedient that the following provisions should be adopted:—1. That the office of Chief Judge in Bankruptcy should be separated from the office of Vice-Chancellor, and that the business of the winding up of companies should be transferred to the Court of Bankruptcy; and that an additional judge of the Chancery Division should be appointed, who should take business set down before the Master of the Rolls, such additional judge to act as Chief Judge in Bankruptcy until a separate judge in bankruptcy is appointed.—2. That a moderate fee for hearing before the official referees should be substituted for the present high rate of fees, so as to allow of the full advantage being obtained by the public of the institution under recent legislation of official references.—3. That the jurisdiction of the county courts be extended, so that the limit of pecuniary amount may be the same in common law as in equity.—4. That with regard to criminal business the principle of the constitution of the Central Criminal Court should be applied throughout England and Wales, and that criminal business requiring the presence of a judge of the High Court of Justice should be taken in connection with the local quarter sessions, and that a revision should be made of the classes of cases proper to be tried before judges of the High Court of Justice and before the court of quarter sessions respectively, so that only the gravest cases may be reserved for trial before the judges of the High Court.—5. That, as regards civil business on circuit, there should be one list of cases for the circuit, each case entered being marked on the list for the place where the trial is desired, and the judge of the High Court proceeding from place to place as the amount of the business at each place permits; and that commission days for civil business be abolished.—6. That, so far as practicable, arrangements should be made for simultaneous sittings at Guildhall and at Westminster for the trial of civil cases.”

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Feb. 27.—PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE.

The LORD CHANCELLOR, in moving the second reading of this Bill, observed that it would enable the Master of the Rolls, with the sanction of the Treasury and of the department to which the particular class of document might belong, to make rules for the destruction of documents. Such rules were, however, not to be acted on until they had been laid before Parliament.—The Bill was read a second time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Feb. 22.—PRISONS.

The House went into committee on this Bill. Clauses 1 to 3 were agreed to after amendments had been withdrawn.

Clause 4 was postponed.

On clause 5, Sir J. KENNAWAY moved to insert after the word “officer” in line 25, “except as hereinafter provided.” His object was to allow the visiting committee, when vacancies arose, to nominate to the Prison Commissioners persons fit to be appointed to the posts of surgeon and chaplain.—On a division the amendment was lost by 154 to 42.—The clause was then agreed to.

Clauses 6, 7, were agreed to after amendments had been withdrawn.

On clause 8 (duties of Prison Commissioners), Mr. MACDONALD moved in line 21, after “work,” to insert “provided always that such work shall be for the service of the State only, and that no trades have more than a fair proportion of prisoners employed thereon.”—On a

division the amendment was lost by 218 to 70.—Mr. LOCKE moved, clause 8, page 3, lines 21 and 22, to leave out “the amount of their earnings” and insert “so as to provide that any work upon which they shall be employed shall be for the purposes of the prison only and not for profit or sale.”—The amendment was negatived.—The clause was agreed to.

On clause 10, progress was reported.

PRISONS (IRELAND).

The House went into committee on this Bill and progress was immediately reported.

JUSTICES' CLERKS.

This Bill passed through committee.

COUNTY BOARDS (IRELAND).

Captain NOLAN introduced a Bill for the formation of elective county boards in Ireland.

Feb. 26.—BEER LICENCES (IRELAND).

This Bill passed through committee.

RATEABLE PROPERTY (IRELAND).

Mr. W. H. SMITH introduced a Bill to amend the law relating to the valuation of rateable property in Ireland.

Feb. 27.—SETTLED ESTATES.

This Bill was read a second time.

BILLS BEFORE PARLIAMENT.

A Bill to amend the Law relating to Costs in the High Court of Justice.

[Sir H. M. Jackson, Mr. Leeman, and Mr. Alfred Marten.]

Whereas it is just and expedient that a successful litigant be indemnified, so far as possible, against the costs reasonably incurred by him in the ordinary course of the litigation:

And whereas under the system of taxing costs as between party and party, a successful litigant is liable to bear a large proportion of those costs:

Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

1. *Short title.*] This Act may be cited as the Costs Act, 1877.

2. *Rule as to allowance of costs.*] Where in any legal proceeding in the Supreme Court of Judicature the costs of any party to the proceeding are ordered to be paid or borne by another party to the proceeding or by a fund or estate, those costs shall, unless the court for special reasons otherwise directs, include, in addition to the costs now allowed on taxation as between party and party, all other costs, charges, and expenses reasonably incurred in or incidental to or for the purposes of the proceeding.

Provided that this Act shall not apply to any proceeding for the recovery of a penalty.

Courts.

WRECK COMMISSION COURT.*

WESTMINSTER.

(Before H. C. ROTHERY, Esq., Commissioner; and Captain FOSTER, R.N., and Captain RONALDSON, Assessors.)

Feb. 14, 15, 26.—*The H. A. Brightman.*

This was an inquiry, directed by the Board of Trade, into the circumstances attending the stranding of the screw steamer *H. A. Brightman* on the coast of Kent on the 1st of January.

Noel Paterson appeared for the Board of Trade.

Aspinall, for the owners of the vessel.

Howard (solicitor), for the master.

At the close of the examination of the captain by counsel for the Board of Trade,

The COMMISSIONER directed that counsel for the master should first cross-examine, and then counsel for the owners.

* Reported by NOEL H. PATERSON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

At the close of the examination of witnesses who were on board at the time of the casualty, the Board of Trade charged the master with default in not having used all possible means to avoid the stranding of his ship. They declined to charge the owners, but requested the opinion of the court upon the question whether, from want of sufficient water-ballast or otherwise, the ship was in any way in an unseaworthy condition.

The owners had, on finding no formal charge was made against them, declined to appear further in the inquiry.

Paterson, for the Board of Trade, requested the opinion of the commissioner as to whether the owners, having obtained leave to appear under r. 9, and thereby become by that rule parties to the proceedings, were not parties throughout the inquiry.

The COMMISSIONER ruled that they were still parties.

Further evidence was then given as to the construction of the vessel.

Howard then addressed the court on behalf of the master.

Paterson, in reply, argued that, as the rules did not contemplate any one being formally charged unless it were a person against whom the court could take action, as by cancelling or suspending a certificate, the Board of Trade were right in not formally charging the owners, especially as the only charge that could be made against them would be of a statutory misdemeanour, which, being a commercial offence, the court could not deal with; and that, as the owners had a right under the rules to become parties, they were amply protected; and, therefore, the Board of Trade were justified in asking the court to pronounce an opinion on the state of the vessel, and to order the owners to pay costs if it thought it a fit case for such an order.

The COMMISSIONER, in delivering judgment, stated that he thought the court should not be asked to pronounce an opinion adverse to any person unless that person was formally charged, and that the construction attempted to be put upon the rule as to making a charge was too technical; and that, although the court had full power to act as it thought right although no formal charge was made, the court ought to be left to its purely judicial duties, and not asked to act as a public prosecutor. He returned the master's certificate, with an admonition as to what means he might have used to save his ship; and, while finding that the vessel was not in a fit state for the voyage she was on, thought that, as her faults were not such as seemed to be peculiar to the particular ship, he should direct that all parties should pay their own costs.

The Solicitor to the Board of Trade.

Solicitors for the master, *Oliver & Botterill.*

Solicitors for the owners, *Lyne & Holman.*

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

March 2, 1877.

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	—
Stock	Caledonian	100	124
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	106
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	51 $\frac{1}{2}$
Stock	Great Northern	100	127 xd
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	128 $\frac{1}{2}$
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	104 $\frac{1}{2}$
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	127 xd
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	119
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	20 $\frac{1}{2}$
Stock	London and North-Western	100	147 xd
Stock	London and South Western	100	130
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	73
Stock	Metropolitan	100	105 $\frac{1}{2}$
Stock	Do., District	100	46
Stock	Midland	100	127 xd
Stock	North British	100	99
Stock	North Eastern	100	154
Stock	North London	100	137
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	67
Stock	South Devon	100	69
Stock	South-Eastern	100	124 $\frac{1}{2}$

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, '96 $\frac{1}{2}$	Annuities, April, '78, 9 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ditto for Account, April '96 $\frac{1}{2}$	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1868
Do. 3 per Cent. Reduced, 95 $\frac{1}{2}$ xd	Ex Bills, £1000, 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent. 12 p.m.
New 3 per Cent., 95 $\frac{1}{2}$ xd	Ditto, £500, Do., 12 p.m.
Do. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £300, 12 p.m.
Do. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, — per
Do. 3 per Cent., Jan. '78	Ct. (last half-year), 261
Annuities, Jan. '80	Ditto for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

3 per Cent. Paper, July, '88, 106	Ditto, 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ per Cent., May, '79, 91
Ditto for Account, —	Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent.
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88, 103 xd	April, '84
Ditto, ditto, Certificates —	Do., 5 per Cent., Aug. '73
Ditto Encased Ppr., 4 per Cent., 88	Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
2nd Enf. Pr., 4 per C., Jan. '72	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

At the annual meeting of the English and Scottish Law Life Assurance Association it was reported that the number of new policies issued in 1876 was 716, assuring £395,075, the new premiums being £16,471. The net income from premiums and interest was £169,890, and the invested funds amounted to £961,678.

Messrs. Evans & Swaine have recently patented a very ingenious method of fireproof construction. Wood and plaster only are used, iron being entirely avoided. The plan adopted is as follows:—The inventors place ordinary timber joists of any uniform depth, generally 9in. or 11in. for ordinary floors and spans up to 25ft., on the walls in the ordinary way, only, instead of placing them, as is usual in constructing an ordinary floor of wood joists and boards, with a space between the joists, they are placed without any intervening space. The ends of the joists are allowed to bear on the walls in the usual way (only one plate is required), and the last joist at each end of a series of joists is also allowed to bear upon the walls. The sides of the joists are brought into intimate contact by being bolted up close, and the result is a solid slab or floor of timber of the size of the room, bearing on the walls on all four sides, of enormous strength, and capable of bearing almost any weight that may be put on it, and yet exerting no outward thrust upon the walls. So that a fire raging in a room either beneath or above a floor of this description can attack it on one side only, there are no interstices for the air to pass between, and the flames cannot play round the timber, but only attack it on the under side, if below the floor, or the upper side, if above the floor, and the wood will not become charred to any great depth, at the most 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. or 2in.—the main bulk of the timber remains sound and uninjured, and still capable of bearing the weight of any amount of property stored above; whilst there is no danger of the action of the water from the fire engines causing the floor to fly and give way, as in the case of one constructed of iron. A floor thus constructed would, in itself, be nearly perfectly fireproof, but as an additional protection the inventors bring to their aid the fire-resisting properties of common plaster. After the floor has been constructed, as above described, and a solid slab of wood formed, the inventors drive, at close intervals, into the under surface of the floor forming the ceiling below, a number of flat-headed nails; this forms a key for the plaster, and the ceiling is then plastered in the ordinary way, with a good thick coat of common plaster, care being taken to use a tough plaster that will not shrink and crack, rather than a hard and brittle one. This coat of plaster would resist an immense heat, until it became calcined and red hot itself, but even then the under-surface of the wood becomes only charred with the heat of the plaster, and its strength remains unimpaired for a very long period; in fact, a floor so constructed is as perfectly fireproof as it is possible to obtain. And the inventors state, in addition to its other advantages, it is perfectly noiseless in use, and in any room or building where it is applied as a floor the sound of feet is scarcely heard, whilst in the rooms below the sounds made above are unheard, the floor being in all respects practically sound-proof.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

JACKMAN—Feb. 22, at Lymington, Hants, the wife of Edwin Jackman, solicitor and town clerk, of a son.
YEATMAN—Feb. 25, at 35, Colby-road, Gipsy-hill, S.E., the wife of Pym Yeatman, of 6, King's Bench-walk, Temple, barrister-at-law, of a son.

MARRIAGE.

MORTEN—TOMS—Feb. 24, at St. Saviour's, South Hampstead, Edward Morten, of the Inner Temple, to Mary Fanny Toms, of The Elms, Hampton.

DEATHS.

GODFREY-FAUSSETT—Feb. 26, at the Precincts, Canterbury, Thomas G. Godfrey-Faussett, F.S.A., barrister-at-law, aged 47.

LANYON—Feb. 27, Charles Mortimer Lanyon, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, aged 36.

RAIMONDI—Feb. 22, at Oakfield-road, Croydon, Charles Henry Raimondi, solicitor, aged 38.

RICHES—Feb. 22, at Cambridge, Mary Livingstone, the wife of Alfred Smith Riches, solicitor, aged 65.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Feb. 23, 1877.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Boothwood Paper Mills Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 19, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Saturday, March 3. Raven and Co, Queen Victoria st, agents for Hindle, Darwen, solicitor for the petitioner.

Brent Moon China Clay and Mica Works Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated Feb 16, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Chapman and Co, Lincoln's Inn Fields solicitors for the petitioner.

Grammes Magneto Electric Company, Limited.—V.C. Malins has, by an order dated Feb 18, appointed William Cooper, Angel rd, Brixton, to be official liquidator.

Hawme Collieries Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 21, directed to be heard before the M.R. on March 3. Harper and Co, Hood lane, solicitors for the petitioners.

West London Tramways Company, Limited.—The M.R. has, by an order dated Nov 23, 1875, appointed William Fountain Woods, Markham sq, Chelsea, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Feb 28, 1877, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Wednesday, March 11, at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

TUESDAY, Feb. 27, 1877.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Brynmawr Coal and Iron Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated Feb 16, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Davis and Co, Coleman st, solicitors for the petitioners.

David Lloyd and Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 23, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on Friday, March 9. Tucker and Lake, Serle st, Lincoln's Inn, agents for Wragge and Co, Birmingham, solicitors for the petitioners.

Hooper's Telegraph Works, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Feb 17, it was ordered that the above works be wound up. Tissard and Co, Old Jewry, solicitors for the petitioner.

Milan Tramways Company, Limited.—V.C. Hall has, by an order dated Jan 12, appointed Alfred Good, Poultry, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before April 10, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Wednesday, April 15, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Worthington Collieries Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Feb 17, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Fins and Co, East India avenue, solicitors for the petitioners.

Workmen's Dwellings Improvement Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 22, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on March 9. Minet and Co, New Broad st, solicitors for the petitioners.

Talscedwyn Iron, Steel, and Coal Company, Limited.—The M.R. has, by an order dated Jan 18, appointed Samuel Lowell Price, Gresham st, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required on or before March 29, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Thursday, April 12, at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

STANZAARIES OF CORNWALL.

Bosworry Mining Company.—By an order made by the Vice Warden, dated Feb 22, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Hodge and Co, Truro, solicitors for the petitioners.

East Wheal Grenville Mining Company.—By an order made by the Vice Warden, dated Feb 22, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Hodge and Co, Truro, solicitors for the petitioners.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Feb. 27, 1877.

Provident Benefit Society, Globe Inn, Maidstone, Kent. Feb 22

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, Feb. 20, 1877.

Bestham, William, Swaine Green, York, Grocer. April 11. Hopkinson v Hopkinson, V.C. Malins. Browning, Bradford.

Boden, William Thomas, Ringmore, Devon, Gent. March 19. Stradling v Boden, V.C. Hall. Whidborne, Teignmouth.

Hornby, Gerard, Liverpool, Watch Manufacturer. March 18. Hornby v Wilkinson, V.C. Malins. Wilson, Liverpool.

Jones, Catherine, Cranmer rd, Brixton rd. March 23. Jones v Jones, V.C. Hall. Fraser, Furnival's Inn.

Latch, Joseph, Newport, Monmouth, Merchant. March 8. Latch v Latch, V.C. Hall. Llewellyn, Newport.

Lewis, Henry, Vassall rd, Brixton. March 17. Woodhouse v Lewis, V.C. Hall. Clayton, Lancaster place, Strand.

Lumley, James, jun, Sharples, nr Bolton, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. March 16. Lumley v Lord, M.R. Milne and Co, Harcourt buildings, Temple. May, V.C. Hall. Ewbank and Parlington, South sq, Gray's Inn. Metcalfe, John Abraham, Hill Top, Westmoreland, Gent. March 17. Morris v Smith, M.R. Garnett and Co, Liverpool. Morris, Henry, Poissy, France, Artist. March 12. Morris v Morris, Registrar Liverpool District. Sawdon, John, Pickering, York, Gent. March 13. Sawdon v Loy, M.R. Parkinson, Pickering.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Feb. 16, 1877.

Auger, William, Burnham, Essex, Oyster Merchant. April 3. Gepp and Sons, Chelmsford.

Barnes, Edward, Byfield, Northampton, Farmer. March 1. Roche, Daventry.

Beck, Thomas Saew, Portland place, Doctor of Medicine. April 30. Coote, Curstor st, Chancery lane.

Brighton, Henry, Shottesham, Norfolk, Machine Proprietor. March 9. Laverack, Kingston-upon-Hull.

Bud'ent, Cornelius, Hogsthorpe, Lincoln, Farmer. June 1. Bourne and Rhodes, Alford.

Bursole, Jessie, Rusthall, Kent. March 13. Young and Co, St Mildred's court, Poultry.

Col, Arthur, Walk Mill, Kirkby Ireleth, Lancashire, Shoemaker. March 17. Butler, Broughton-in-Furness.

Collier, Henry, Twickenham, Butcher. March 31. Guillaume and Sons, Fleet st.

Craig, James, Buxton, Lancashire, Farmer. March 17. Butler, Broughton-in-Furness.

Davis, Eleanor Arklow, Southampton. April 10. Hickman and Son, Southampton.

Dickson, Harriet, Portman sq, St Marylebone. March 29. Mayall and Pemberton, Whitehall place.

Farrer, Thomas, Gateside, York, Yeoman. March 31. Thomson and Wilson, Kendal.

Hemsted, Anne, Newbury, Berks. April 17. Mace and Son, Thatcham.

Herbert, Hannah, North st, Red Lion sq. April 2. Drawbridge, Great James st, Bedford row.

Hodgson, John, Argoed Hall, Denbigh, Esq. May 1. Longsville and Co, Oswestry.

Hughes, Elizabeth, Llanrwst, Denbigh. March 26. Tee, Frederick's place, Old Jewry.

Jacob, Charles, St George's rd, Pimlico, Esq. March 31. Rolt, Skinner's place, Queen Victoria st.

Kirk, Thomas, Sutton, York, Gent. March 14. Owst-Atkinson and Wake, Hull.

Parke, Richard, Thistlet grove, West Brompton, Gent. April 9. Wansey and Bownes, Moorgate st.

Pavnter, Ann, Bortenna, Cornwall. March 8. Bennett, Red Lion sq, Peirson, John, York, Land Agent. March 12. Watson, Middleborough.

Pulman, Robert, Bristol, Clothier. March 25. Beckingham, Bristol.

Radley, Elizabeth, Worksop, Nottingham. March 31. Hodding and Beever, Worksop.

Ridgdale, Edward, Barnsley, Gent. April 17. Fenton and Owen, Huddersfield.

Sales, Francis John, Woolwich, Kent, Gent. March 25. Hughes, Woolwich.

Seward, Eliza, Knightsbridge, Hants. March 31. Talbot, Newbury.

Snowle, Alexander, Osney crescent, Kentish town, Clerk in Bank of England. March 13. Ellis and Co, St Swithin's lane.

Sue sing, Laban, Barnham, Essex, Oyster Merchant. March 10. Gepp and Sons, Chelmsford.

Taylor, Joseph, Prince's Risborough, Bucks, Timber Merchant. March 12. Booth, Gray's inn sq.

Vickery, John, Dutton, Lancashire, Farmer. March 1. Banks and Kendall, Prescot.

Waller, George, Malford, Fender Grinder. March 31. Wilson, Sheffield.

Waring, Sarah, Worksop, Nottingham. March 31. Hodding and Besvor, Worksop.

Wilson, Betty, Broughton-in-Furness, Lancashire. March 17. Butler, Broughton-in-Furness.

Wood, Mary, Southport, Lancashire. March 21. Mayhew and Adecock, Wigan.

Worthington, John, Preston, Lancashire, Gent. March 1. Threlfall, Southport.

Wright, William, Littlebury, Essex, Bricklayer. April 2. Thurgood, Saffron Walden.

Young, Eliza, Surbiton hill, Surrey. March 31. Dod and Longstaffe, Berners st.

TUESDAY, Feb. 20, 1877.

Arrowsmith, Peter, Pendleton, Lancashire, Geot. March 31. Weston and Co, Manchester.

Aston, Thomas, Temple Laugherne, Worcester, Esq. March 24.

Parker, Worcester.

Baker, Frances, Maldon, Essex. March 16. Pope, Colchester.

Barrington, Frances Lyon, Hetton Hall, Durham, Esq. May 31.

Gamble and Son, Gray's inn.

Blake, Emma, Handsworth, Stafford. April 1. Burton, Birmingham.

Blake, Robert, Handsworth, Stafford, Jeweller. April 1. Burton, Birmingham.

Boyce, Richard, Old Jewry chambers, Solicitor. April 14. Lawrence and Co, Old Jewry chambers.

Bruce, William Downing, Spanish Town, Jamaica, H.M.'s Judge. May 15. Compton-Smith, Lincoln's Inn fields.

Clough, Henry, Doncaster, York, Innkeeper. March 19. Collinson and Co, Doncaster.

Corps, Sarah, Yarnham, Surrey. March 22. Hollies and Mason, Farnham.

Croote, William, Leyford, Devon, Land Agent. April 16. Petherick, Exeter.

Dickinson, John, Abbott's Hill, Hartford, Esq. May 1. Birchams and Co, Parliament st, Westminster
 Gascoyne, William, Hassop, Derby, Farmer. March 31. Guts and Co, Chesterfield
 Hamilton, John, Birmingham, Gent. March 20. Whately and Co, Birmingham
 Harwood, Elizabeth, Beulah place, Wood green. March 25. Laundry and Son, Cecil st, Strand
 Humble, Mary Anne, Vicar's cross, nr Chester. March 17. Bridgman and Co, Chester
 Johnson, John Hodgson, Cuning Garth, Cumberland, Yeoman. March 19. Carrick and Son, Wigton
 Johnson, John, Bold, Lancashire, Farmer. March 21. Ansell and Son, St Helen's
 Jones, George Paske, Leamington, Warwick, Esq. March 20. Paterson and Co, Chancery lane
 Kendall, Thomas, Norfolk place, Bateman's row, Shoreditch, Stationer's Machinist. May 1. Hillery, Crutched friars
 Little, James, Caledonian rd, Islington, Finsbury circus
 Digby and Little, Circus place, Finsbury circus
 Marshall, William Randall, Amersham on the hill, New cross. April 18. Hollingsworth and Co, East India avenue
 McNeil, James, Preston, Lancashire, Tailor. April 1. Ascroft, Preston Murray, Dorothy, Chester-le-Street, Durham. March 23. Stewart, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Neale, William, Reigate, Surrey, Brewer. March 25. Morrison, Yeager
 Palmer, Edward, Hackney rd, Furniture Manufacturer. June 8. Naunton, Cheapside
 Rawlinson, Thomas, Knowsley, Lancashire, Farmer. March 31. Ansell and Son, St Helen's
 Reid, Rawson Hart Boddam, Stratford place, Esq. April 2. Johnsons and Co, Anstinfairs
 Samarez, Rev Paul, Pembroke rd, Kensington. March 16. Johnsons and Co, Cheapside
 Shilson, William, Dinhamb, Treverrick, Cornwall, Solicitor. March 31. Derry, Plymouth
 Snowdon, William, Masby, Lincoln, Tea Hawker. April 14. Falkner and Owen, Louth
 Ward, John, East Mersea, Essex, Farmer. March 25. Pope, Colchester.

FRIDAY, Feb. 23, 1877.

Barker, William, Margate, Kent, Gent. April 21. Sankey and Co, Margate
 Biggs, Thomas, Edgbaston, Birmingham, Gent. March 31. Whately and Co, Birmingham
 Brown, John Heugh, Kingston-upon-Hull, Gent. April 2. Lightfoot and Co, Hull
 Cheeswright, Thomas Lewis, Brighton, Sussex. March 31. Davis and Co, Coleman st
 Clark, Thomas, Derndale, Hereford. March 31. Onions, Brighton Cragg, Richard, Preston, Lancashire, Provision Merchant. March 20. Ascroft, Preston
 Creepin, Edgar Reginald Legassick, Harrington sq, Esq. April 1. Eigoold, Lincoln's inn fields
 Day, Ann, Belper, Derby. March 31. Jackson, Belper
 Dray, Pearson, Broadstairs, Kent, Brewer. April 21. Sankey and Co, Margate
 Dudley, William, Birmingham, Merchant. March 31. Saunders and Bradbury, Birmingham
 Eden, John, Oxford st, Licensed Victualler. May 1. Indermaur, Devonshire terrace, Portland place
 Ellis, Samuel, Sheffield, Gent. April 20. Brown and Son, Sheffield
 Graves, Walter Swithin, Cardiff, Glamorgan. April 7. Waldron, Cardiff
 Harvey, William, George st, Hanover sq, Surgeon. March 31. Walker and Co, Southampton st, Bloomsbury
 Hobbs, James, Eglington rd, Old Ford, Publican. March 20. Lindo and Co, King's Arms yard, Moorgate st
 Kelk, Charles William, Brunswick place north, Sussex, Gent. April 1. Stuckey, Brighton
 Kirk, John, March, Cambridge, Farmer. March 31. Dawbarn and Wise, March
 Maclean, Sarah, Eding, Middlesex. April 1. Deacon and Co, Paul's Bakeshouse court, Doctors' common
 Marland, Robert, Southport, Lancashire, Gent. March 20. Welsby and Co, Southport
 Marryon, Charles, Leeman st, Whitechapel, Veterinary Surgeon. March 19. Mitchell, Great Prescot st, Whitechapel
 McTurk, Andrew, Sheffield, Gent. May 1. Fratton and Son, Sheffield
 Mou, James, Chelmsford, Bayswater, Gent. March 31. Emmet and Son, Bloomsbury sq
 Oates, William, Portman st, Portman sq, Publisher. April 20. Ward and Co, Gray's inn sq
 Owihwatz, Mary Ann, Hereford rd, Bayswater. March 25. Nickinson and Co, Chancery lane
 Priestley, John Hartley, Alton, York, Farmer. March 31. Gill and Hall, Wakefield
 Primo, David, Crescent, Bow common. March 31. Scott, College hill Quin, Stephen, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Draper. May 1. Leadbitter and Harvey, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Rooke, Thomas James, Highbury hill, Solicitor. May 1. Rooke, Great James st, Bedford row
 Salmon, Mary, Woodbridge, Suffolk. April 20. Layton and Co, Budge row, Cannon st
 Secker, Rev Edward Barlow, High Offley, Stafford. March 19. Morgan, Stafford
 Shar, William, Liverpool, Gent. March 20. Lindo and Co, King's Arms yard, Moorgate st
 Smith, John, Grange, Shepherd's bush, Gent. March 25. Chester, Addison rd, Kensington
 Smith, William, Littlehales, Salop, Land Agent. March 31. Liddle, Newport
 Stephenson, William, Throckley House, Northumberland, Farmer. May 1. Leadbitter and Harvey, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Taylor, Herbert, Uttoxeter, Stafford, Doctor of Medicine. April 10. Hand, Uttoxeter
 Taylor, Thomas, Wigan, Lancashire, Colliery Furnaceman. March 29. Stuart, Wigan

Warburton, Mary Ann, Chichester. April 2. Raper and Freeland, Chichester
 Warren, Daniel, Porchester terrace, Paddington, Merchant. April 20. Johnson and Co, Austinfairs
 Wilson, William, Auchinglas Farm, Natal, Merchant. March 12. Gill ChenPide
 Woods, Williams, Chichester, Pork Butcher. April 2. Raper and Freeland, Chichester

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Feb. 23, 1877.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

Dawbarn, Edward Philip, Union court, Old Broad st, Coal Merchant. Pet Feb 13. Haslett, March 7 at 1
 Key, John, Chancery rd, Dulwich, Auctioneer's Clerk. Pet Feb 16. Keene, March 5 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Cockerell, Oliver, Allerton, York, Oil Manufacturer. Pet Feb 20. Robinson, Bradford, March 6 at 9
 Hodges, Thomas, Darlington, Durham, Builder. Pet Feb 20. Crosby, Stockton-on-Tees, March 8 at 3

Jones, David, Newport, Mon, Draper. Pet Feb 17. Davis, Newport, March 9 at 3
 Mason, Samuel, De ddington, Oxford, Axletree Maker. Pet Jan 19. Bishop, Oxford
 Newman, Charles Henry, East Margate, Brewer's Assistant. Pet Feb 16. Furley, Canterbury, March 9 at 2.30
 Thom, Robert, Higher Tranmere, Cheshire, Commission Agent. Pet Feb 19. Watson, Birkenhead, March 9 at 11
 Whittaker, Joseph, Macclesfield, Chester, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 19. Mair, Macclesfield, March 9 at 11
 Whiteley, James, Eckington, Derby, Joiner. Pet Feb 15. Wake, Chesterfield, March 10 at 11

TUESDAY, Feb. 27, 1877.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Stringer, William, Judd st, King's cross, Coal Merchant. Pet Feb 22. Pepys, March 14 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Cottam, John, Laxton-on-the-Moor, York, Publican. Pet Feb 22. Wake, Sheffield, March 14 at 12
 Procter, Henry, Lindsey, Worcester, Horse Dealer. Pet Feb 19. Campbell, Warwick, March 14 at 11
 Shearing, Thomas, Fisherton, Salisbury, Wilts, Draper. Pet Feb 22. Wilson, Salisbury, March 10 at 12

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Feb. 23, 1877.

Honour, John, and Henry Castle, Osney, Oxford, Builders. Feb 20. Wimble, Edward, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Chemist. March 5

TUESDAY, Feb. 27, 1877.

Chambers, Christopher, New Union st, Moor lane, Skirt Manufacturer. Feb 24

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, Feb. 23, 1877.

Ackers, William, Liverpool, Brewer. March 14 at 12 at offices of Miller and Co, Harrington st, Liverpool
 Allen, Charles, Swanso, Public House Manager. March 6 at 11 at offices of Thomas, York place, Swanso
 Amas, George, Buntingford, Hertford, Tailor. March 9 at 2.30 at the Lion Hotel, Petty Cury, Cambridge. Nash, Royston
 Archard, Joseph Frederick, Bath, Journeyman Cabinet Maker. March 1 at 12 at the Saracen's Head Hotel, Temple gate, Bristol. Hobbs, jun, Wells
 Austin, Josiah, Vauxhall walk, Licensed Victualler. March 3 at 10 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, King, Philip lane
 Barlow, Joseph, Manchester, Provision Dealer. March 9 at 3 at offices of Burton, King st, Manchester
 Bastin, Emma, Worcester, Hatter. March 6 at 11.30 at offices of Corbett, Avenue House, The Cross, Worcester
 Besley, Richard Gale, Tiverton, Devon, Butcher. March 8 at 3 at offices of Loosmore, St Peter st, Tiverton
 Biggs, John, Wolverhampton, Hay Dealer. March 6 at 3 at offices of Dallow, Queen sq, Wolverhampton
 Blackburn, Crowther, Hockmondwike, York, Fruit Merchant. March 8 at 11 at offices of Ibberson, Bank buildings, Hockmondwike
 Blenkinstow, William, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Grocer. March 5 at 3 at offices of Stanford, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Brande, Rev William Thomas Charles, Pultborough, Sussex. March 16 at 2 at the Swan Hotel, Pultborough. Mant, Sterington
 Brebner, Robert, Liverpool, Commission Agent. March 14 at 2 at offices of Gibson and Bolland, South John st, Liverpool. Collins and Co, Liverpool
 Brittain, Daniel, Bilton, Stafford, Grocer. March 8 at 3 at offices of Bowen, Mount Pleasant, Bilton
 Brittain, William, Liverpool, Provision Merchant. March 16 at 3 at offices of Norton and Mason, Victoria st, Liverpool
 Broadbent, Joseph Knowles, Cheadle, Lancashire, Engineer. March 7 at 3 at offices of Hankinson, St James sq, Manchester
 Brown, William, Bradford, York, Watchmaker. March 12 at 4 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrrell st, Bradford
 Brownlow, William, Hucknall, Torkard, Nottingham, Green grocer. March 16 at 12 at offices of Fraser, Wheeler gate, Nottingham
 Budden, Thomas, Hinton, Dorset, Brick Manufacturer. March 7 at 11 at offices of Travers, King st, Poole
 Bury, James Lowdes, and William Edward Bury, Manchester. March 7 at 3.30 at offices of Best, Lower King st, Manchester
 Carr, William, Liverpool, Provision Merchant. March 8 at 3 at offices of Lupton, Harrington st, Liverpool
 Carter, Edwin, Farnsford, Huntingdon, Corn Merchant. March 9 at 1 at the Dolphin Inn, St Ives. Gache, Peterborough
 Challen, Benjamin Richard Seymour, King Henry's walk, Ball's Pond, Dealer in Preserved Provisions. March 14 at 12 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Stone and Co

Chipping, Edward Frederick, Edmond's place, City rd, Watchmaker. March 12 at 10 at offices of Sampson, Marylebone rd

Clarke, George, Hanley, Stafford, Potter. March 6 at 12 at the Copeland Arms Inn, Stoke-upon-Trent. Shires, Leicester

Coldham, James, Belchamp Otten, Essex, Innkeeper. March 15 at 3 at offices of Jones, Town Hall chambers, Colchester

Cole, John, Bristol, Labourer. March 9 at 11 at offices of Essery, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol

Collins, John, Goodrich, Hereford, Innkeeper. March 7 at 12 at offices of Davies, Ede Cross st, Ross

Coulson, John, Wellington, Durham, no occupation. March 9 at 11 at offices of Chapman, Market place, Durham

Crossland, James Stead, Manchester, Engineer. March 12 at 12 at offices of Sutton and Elliott, Fountain st, Manchester

Curtis, George Graham, Ipswich, Baker. March 10 at 10.30 at offices of Mills, Elm st, Ipswich

Davies, William Francis, Pontypool, Monmouth, Grocer. March 7 at 2 offices of Parsons, High st, Newport. Lloyd, Pontypool

Davies, William Henry, Deal, Kent, Common Brewer. March 8 at 3.30 at the Royal Hotel, Beach st, Deal. Sankey and Co, Canterbury

Day, Jesse Henry, Maryport, Cumberland, Concrete Builder. March 15 at 11 at 27a, Kirkstall, Maryport. Collier

Drakeford, Alfred, Bedworth, Warwick, Boiler Maker. March 6 at 12 at offices of Neale, Hay lane, Coventry

Dyer, William, Idles, Cornwall, Farmer. March 5 at 3 at offices of Paul, Quay st, Truro

Edgerton, Joseph, Chertsey, Stafford, Engineer. March 6 at 3 at offices of Hollinshead, Tunstall

Evans, Benjamin, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 10 at 11 at offices of Williams, Canon st, Aberdare

Evans, John, Neath, Glamorgan, Tailor. March 8 at 11 at offices of Charles, Parade, Neath

Evans, Thomas William, Dowlais, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 3 at 11 at offices of Lewis, Gledland st, Merthyr Tydfil

Fairer, William, Manchester, Builder. March 14 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester

Finch, Edward James, Eastbourne, Sussex, Engineer. March 12 at 3 at offices of Hayward, King st, Cheapside

Geachins, William Henry, Exeter, Woollen Draper. March 8 at 11 at the George Hotel, Huddersfield, Fryer

Gibson, James, Manchester, Corn Merchant. March 12 at 2 at offices of Cobbett and Co, Brown st, Manchester

Goldsmith, George, Back hill, Hatton garden, Licensed Victualler. March 7 at 5 at offices of Lee, New inn, Strand

Goldsmith, George, Cobham, Surrey, Saddler. March 7 at 2 at the White Lion Hotel, Cobham, Geach, Guildford

Goodall, Henry, and Arthur Walker, Heckmondwike, York, Blanket Manufacturers. March 12 at 3 at the Royal Hotel, Market place, Dewsbury. Learoyd and Co, Huddersfield

Graemann, Carl, Royal Exchange buildings, Ship Broker. March 14 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Denby

Green, Henry, Neath, Glamorgan, Colliery Proprietor. March 8 at 12 at offices of Curtis, Queen st, Neath

Guerin, Louis, Newgate st, Eating House Keeper. March 12 at 3 at 122, Newgate st, Lowe, Scott's yard, Bush lane

Gwynn, William, Burry Port, Carmarthen, Licensed Victualler. March 9 at 11 at offices of Howell, Steppeney st, Llanelli

Halestadt, Henry, Leeds, Cloth Manufacturer. March 10 at 1 at offices of Pullan, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds

Ham, John Emanuel, Sketty, nr Swansea, Innkeeper. March 8 at 11 at the Castle Hotel, Swansea. Beddoe, Merthyr Tydfil

Harding, James, Torquay, Devon, Pawnbroker. March 6 at 12 at the Bedford Hotel, Covent garden. Carter and Son, Torquay

Harris, William, Banbury, Oxford, Hawker. March 7 at 3 at offices of Crosby, Bridge st, Banbury

Harrison, Robert, Liverpool, Grocer. March 14 at 3 at offices of Harris, Union court, Castle st, Liverpool

Hartley, Joseph, Bradford, Staff Merchant. March 9 at 12 at offices of Atkinson, Tyrrell st, Bradford

Hesenelever, Albert, Bradford, Wool Merchant. March 7 at 10.30 at offices of Wood and Killick, Commercial Bank buildings, Bradford

Hawkins, Thomas, Moxley, Staffs, Colliery Proprietor. March 12 at 10 at offices of Slatar and Marshal, Butcroft, Darlaston

Hensy, Robert Farrington, Birmingham, Dealer in Novelties. March 5 at 12 at 145, Cheapside, East, Birmingham

Hickling, Henry, Nottingham, Coal Dealer. March 16 at 3 at offices of Dawson and Wright, Weekday Cross, Nottingham

Higginson, John, Holford Hall, Cheshire, Farmer. March 14 at 3 at offices of Grundy and Kershaw, Booth st, Manchester

Hill, Elisha, Gateshead, Durham, Innkeeper. March 9 at 2 at offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Hirst, Alfred, Nottingham, Boot Maker. March 12 at 12 at offices of Wintingham, Exchange walk, Nottingham

Hirst, James, Dudley Hill, York, Builder. March 3 at 10 at offices of Lee and Co, New Isgate, Bradford

Holliday, John Marshall, Rubton, Denbigh, Ironfounder. March 9 at 3 at the Lion Hotel, Wrexham. Burdick and Co

Hewells, Williams, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Beerhouse Keeper. March 9 at 11 at offices of Daniel and Co, Broad st, Bristol. James, Merthyr Tydfil

Husband, William, Cotham, York, Grocer. March 8 at 11 at offices of Stubbs, Albert rd, Middlesbrough

Hutchinson, George, Leeds, Confectioner. March 8 at 11 at offices of Shackleton and Son, Central Market buildings, Leeds

Huxley, William Thomas, Stockwell park rd, Secretary of a Public Company. March 7 at 1 at offices of Norman, Old Bond st at Jackson, Charles, Lincoln, Tailor. March 3 at 11 at offices of Page, Jno, Flaxengate, Lincoln

Jackson, Christopher, sen, and Christopher Jackson, Jun, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Wine Merchants. March 9 at 2 at 7, Queen st, Cheapside. Learoyd and Co, Albion chambers, Moorgate

Jenks, William Joseph, Cliftonville, Sussex, Livery Stable Keeper. March 14 at 3 at offices of Nye, North st, Brighton

Jenoue, Rev Henry Courtney, Burton Joyce, Nottingham. March 7 at 11 at offices of Heath and Son, St Peter's Church walk, Nottingham

Johnson, Anthony Wardle, Redcar, York, Printer. March 3 at 11 at offices of Spry, Zetland rd, Middlesbrough

Kendrew, Thomas, Rothwell, York, Brick Manufacturer. March 6 at 3 at offices of Simpson and Burrell, Albion st, Leeds

Kennedy, Hugh Lorraine, Wormwood st, Oil Broker. March 12 at 1 at offices of Combe and Wainwright, Staple Inn

Kennerley, Alfred, Newcastle-under-Lyne, Stafford, Grocer. March 6 at 11 at the Copeland Arms Inn, Stoke-upon-Trent. Shires, Leicester

King, Joseph Rix, Bolton, Draper. March 7 at 3 at offices of Rutter, Mawdesley st, Bolton

Knight, James, Monmouth, Nurseryman. March 9 at 2 at offices of Williams, Whitecross st, Monmouth

Lang, William, East Stonehouse, Devon, Grocer. March 9 at 12 at offices of Square, George st, Plymouth

Lawry, Samuel, Charles Hooke, and Sydney Edmund Spooner, Wood st, Cheapside, Manufacturers. March 7 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st, Shearman, Gresham st

Legard, John Hawksworth, Grove, park, Chiswick, Ironmaster. March 9 at 2 at offices of Fletcher and Co, Lothbury. Abrahams and Roffey, Old Jewry

Lewis, Thomas, Wolverhampton, Licensed Victualler. March 8 at 11 at offices of Stratton and Rudland, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Macfie, David, Leadenhall st, Merchant. March 15 at 2 at offices of Nicholson, Railway approach, London bridge. Benson, Clement's inn, Strand

Marsh, Mary, Eastbourne terrace, Paddington, no occupation. March 13 at 3 at offices of Herbert, Gracechurch st

Maule, William Pratt, Bristol, Chemist. March 6 at 3 at offices of Tricks and Co, City chambers, Nicholas st, Bristol. Clifton, Bristol

Morton, Andrew, Thorpdale rd, Hornsey rd, Builder. March 8 at 2 at offices of Bolton, Gray's inn sq

Myers, Samuel, Oiley, York, Timber Merchant. March 8 at 3 at offices of Whiteley, Albion st, Leeds

Neville, William, Reading, Berks, Grocer. March 8 at 12 at offices of Beale and Martin, London st, Reading

Newton, John Best, Thornton Heath, Surrey, Civil Engineer. March 12 at 11 at offices of Elworthy and Co, Courtenay st, Plymouth

Surr and Co

Nix, John, Kettering, Northampton, Machine Owner. March 12 at 12 at offices of Girling, Market sq, Wellingborough

O'Brien, John, Ross, Hereford, Clothier. March 7 at 11 at offices of Innell, High st, Ross. Williams, Ross

Oliver, Walter, Barrow-on-Soar, Leicester, no occupation. March 5 at 12 at offices of Deane and Lickorish, Market place, Longborough

Olliffe, Samuel Francis, Liverpool, Accountant. March 15 at 3 at the Cotton Ware Exchange, Market place, Manchester

Palmer, William Monton, and Robert Palmer, Leeds, Corn Millers. March 8 at 11 at offices of Malcolm, Park row, Leeds

Parsons, Ann, Ironmonger lane, Tailor. March 13 at 4 at offices of Noton, Great Swan alley, Moorgate st

Parsons, Walter Owen, Ironmonger lane, Tailor. March 6 at 4 at offices of Noton, Great Swan alley, Moorgate st

Pepperdine, Lemuel, Nottingham, Grocer. March 8 at 12 at offices of Belk, Middle pavement, Nottingham

Rigden, Frederick Castle, Westbourne park villas, Paddington, Grocer. March 7 at 2 at offices of Cooper and Cass, Portman st, Portman sq

Ritchie, Helen, and John Kingston, Whitechapel rd, Lamp Manufacturers. March 14 at 3 at offices of Wrapp, Great St Helens

Robert, Henry, and Elias Robert, Birmingham, Boot Manufacturers. March 6 at 12 at offices of Southall and Co, Newhall st, Birmingham

Roberts, John Edwin, Margate, Dealer in Fancy Goods. March 8 at 3 at offices of Barnett, New Broad st

Rowe, Maria, Birmingham, Draper. March 16 at 2 at offices of Chew and Sons, Swan st, Manchester

Schröder, Henry, Bermondsey New rd, Tripe Dresser. March 1 at 8 at offices of Chipperfield, Trinity st, Southwark

Sharp, Thomas, Barrow-in-Furness, Butcher. March 7 at 2 at the Victoria Hotel, Church st, Barrow-in-Furness. Jackson

Shaw, Martha, Sarah, Great Bridge, Stafford, Beerhouse Keeper. March 2 at 11 at offices of Stokes, Priory st, Dudley

Skillicorn, George, Liverpool, Baker. March 9 at 3 at offices of Lowe, Castle st, Liverpool

Stedman, Harry Barnard, Liverpool, Chemist. March 8 at 2 at offices of Gill and Archer, Cook st, Liverpool

Stigant, William, Chatham, Pensioner. March 10 at 11 at the Miire Hotel, High st, Chatham, Wymond, Chatham

Swan, Henry, Aston, nr Birmingham, Metal Mixer. March 7 at 3 at offices of Buller and Pickley, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Tarke, Edward, Bristol, Baker. March 5 at 11 at offices of Essery, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol

Taylor, William, Leeds, Grocer. March 14 at 2 at offices of Markland and Davy, Albion st, Leeds

Thompson, Christopher, Burslem, Stafford, Police Constable. March 6 at 1 at the Copeland Arms Inn, Stoke-upon-Trent, Shires, Leicester

Thornley, William, Byker, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Builder. March 10 at 11 at offices of Bowd, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Turnbull, Edward, North Shields, Furniture Dealer. March 6 at 2 at offices of Stanford, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Turncock, John, Talk-on-the-Hill, Stafford, Grocer. March 5 at 11 at offices of Sherratt, Market st, Kidsgrove

Walesby, Edmund Frederick, Great Chart st, East rd, Hoxton, Carpenters. March 7 at 3 at offices of Henderson, Moorgate st buildings. Stopher, Coleman st

Warren, Thomas Peter Bruce, Queen's terrace, St John's wood, Fancy Repository Proprietor. March 5 at 12 at Dick's Coffees House, Fleet st, Maynard

Westaway, Daniel Walter, Tavistock, Devon, Cabinetmaker. March 8 at 12 at offices of Chilcott, Russell st, Tavistock

Wilkinson, William, Birmingham, Engraver. March 9 at 3 at offices of Duke, Temple row, Birmingham

Williams, Robert, Conway, Carnarvon, Butcher. March 8 at 2 at the Albion Inn, Llanrwst, Jones, Conway

Williamson, Alfred, Salford, Provision Dealer. March 19 at 3 at the Falstaff Hotel, Market place, Manchester. Ward, Manchester

Williamson, George, The Grove, Hackney, Bootmaker. March 7 at 2 at offices of Harris, Southwark st, Southwark

Whinot, John, Gateshead, Durham, Joiner. March 7 at 12 at offices of Garbett, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Wilson, Newton, High Holborn, Sewing Machine Manufacturer. March 7 at 11 at the Inns of Court Hotel, High Holborn, Shasen and Co
 Wray, Thomas, Kingston-upon-Hull, Butcher. March 8 at 12 at offices of Stead and Sibro-e, Bishop lane, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Yapp, James, Manchester, Beer Retailer. March 7 at 3 at the Falstaff Hotel, Market place, Manchester, Ward, Manchester
 Tarnall, John Rose, Haggerston rd, Grocer. March 12 at 3 at offices of Watson, King's Arms yard, Moorgate st
 Young, James, Kempston p'mt, Merton st, New North rd, Builder. March 9 at 11 at offices of Russell, Coleman st

TUESDAY, Feb. 27, 1877.

Annan, James Henry, Sunderland, Grocer. March 13 at 3 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland
 Atkinson, Robert, Gateshead, Durham, Agent. March 12 at 1 at offices Bush, Wellington st, Gateshead
 Barber, Thomas, Banton, Line-in, Carpenter. March 10 at 11 at the Bull Hotel, Bourn, Stapleton, Stamford
 Beardmore, John, Dudley, Worcester, Shoe Manufacturer. March 9 at 11 at offices of Taxis, Church lane, Tipton
 Bennett, Samuel, 11, Warwick, Stafford, Travelling Auctioneer. March 10 at 11 at offices of Hake, Bridge st, Walsall
 Blaisted, Frank George, Droylsden, Hants, Baker. March 14 at 3 at the Red Lion Hotel, Farnham, Baker, Farnham
 Blanchard, Edward, Southampton, Tobacco Dealer. March 14 at 1 at offices of Edmonds and Co, High st, Southampton, Green, Freemantle
 Bowen, John, Ettingshall, Stafford, Miner. March 14 at 11 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Brine, Charles, High st, Notting hill, Gasfitter. March 12 at 12 at offices of Kynaston and Gasquet, Queen st, Cheapside
 Brodson, Bynny, North Grimsby, York, Grocer. March 12 at 11 at offices of Peacock, Zealand rd, Middlesborough
 Brown, George, Thorpe by, Lincoln, Farmer. March 13 at 1 at offices of Haddesley and Haddes's, Royal Dock chambers, Great Grimsby
 Browns, Joseph George, Upper Lydbrook, Gloucester, Grocer. March 10 at 3 at offices of Gibb, Tredgar place, Newport, Mon. Williams, Monmouth
 Brumkill, George, Hawswater, Westmorland, Farmer. March 14 at 1.30 at offices of Arison, St Andrew's place, Penrith
 Bull, Thomas, Nottingham, Joiner. March 16 at 12 at offices of Bright, Town Club chamber, Whelegrave, Nottingham
 Burke, Michael, Liverpool, Tailor. March 13 at 3.30 at offices of Gibson and Belland, 8, utto John st, Liverpool, Whiteley and Maddock, Liverpool
 Chalilow, William, The Hough, nr Wimbley, Cheshire, Farmer. March 15 at 3 at offices of Barclay and Henshock, Exchange chamber, Macclesfield
 Clark, Thomas, Doncaster, York, Grocer. March 12 at 2.30 at offices of Fisher, High st buildings, Doncaster
 Cole, John, Leadgate, Durham, Ale Merchant. March 8 at 3 at offices of Stanhope, Collingwood st, Newgate-upon-Tyne
 Collington, Alpheus, 1, d'Nicholas' Wedle, Kingston-upon-Hull, Basket Manufacturers. March 12 at 12 at offices of Stead and Sibro-e, Bishop lane, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Croslan, John, Huddersfield, Draper. March 12 at 11 at offices of Haigh, Albert building, New st, Huddersfield
 Davies, Frederick, Wetherby, Lancashire, Shopkeeper. March 12 at 11 at offices of Winder, 10, Newgate row, Bolton
 De Beer, Arnold, Liverpool, Commission Agent. March 13 at 3 at offices of Biggs, Harrington st, Liverpool
 Denison, Frederick, Waterbeach, Cambridge, Nurseryman. March 10 at 10 at offices of Fosters and Lawrence, Green st, Cambridge
 Dickie, James Chalmers, Burton-upon-Trent, Stafford, Builder's Accountant. March 8 at 11 at offices of Corbett, Avenue House, The Cross, Worcester
 Doe, William, Dartford, Kent, Hardwareman. March 12 at 12 at the New Inn Hall, New Inn, Strand, Wright, New Inn
 Duncan, Thomas, Commercial rd east, Provision Merchant. March 21 at 2 at offices of Smart and Co, Cheapside. Lowless and Co, Martin's lane, Cannon st
 Eason, Henry, Leveton st, Kentish town, Solicitor's Clerk. March 7 at 3 at 10, Thavies in, Holborn circums. Parsons
 Emery, Isaiah, Bilton, St. Foy, Beer Retailer. March 13 at 11 at offices of Glover, Park st, Walsall
 England, Thomas, Cardiff, Gas Rent Collector. March 12 at 11 at offices of Jones, St Mary st, Cardiff
 Evans, John, and Edward Evans, Wolverhampton, Boot Dealers. March 12 at 3 at offices of Stratton and Rudland, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Evans, Robert, Crewe, Cheshire, Wine Merchant. March 6 at 12 at the Queen's Hotel, Chester, Churton, Chester
 Fenwick, Thomas, Middlesborough, Iron Merchant. March 9 at 11 at the Royal Exchange, Middlesborough. Addenbrooke, Middlesborough
 Findon, John, Birmingham, Grocer. March 9 at 12 at offices of Solomon, Ann st, Birmingham
 Fitzgerald, John Dillon, Brighton, Marine Store Dealer. March 12 at 3 at offices of Hubbard, London Joint Stock Bank chambers, West Smithfield
 Forster, Edward, Haltwhistle, Northumberland, Stone Quarryman. March 15 at 2 at offices of Carrick and Co, Haltwhistle
 Foster, John, Not-in-cham., out of business. March 19 at 12 at offices of Smith, Fletchergate, Nottingham
 Fry, Walter, Holles st, Cavendish sq, Merchant. March 9 at 2 at offices of Jenkins, Winchester House, Old Broad st
 Fullam, George Townley, Kingston-upon-Hull, Master Mariner. March 12 at 3 at offices of Summers, M. nor st, Hull
 George, John, Francis st, Tottenhall court rd, Provision Dealer. March 13 at 4 at 11, Clee-side, Philip, Budge row, Cannon st
 Gibson, Jones Robinson, Gove, Cheshire, Provision Dealer. March 8 at 10 at 75, Market st, Crewe, Pointon, Crewe
 Gledhill, John, Huddersfield, Grocer. March 15 at 3 at offices of Bamford and Sykes, John st, Huddersfield
 Glover, John Hippisley Lowder, Hanley, Professor of Music. March 8 at 11 at offices of Tenant, Hanley

Goldberg, Hyams, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Picture Framemaker. March 12 at 2 at offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Gosling, George, Longfleet, Dorset, Corn Dealer. March 12 at 3 at Laing's Hotel, Wimborne Minster, Trevanion, Poole
 Guest, Thomas, South Stockton, York, Builder. March 8 at 11 at the Argyle Hotel, Stockton-on-Tees. Robson, Stockton-on-Tees
 Harris, John, Dudley, Worcester, Grocer. March 9 at 11 at offices of Lowe, Wolverhampton st, Dudley
 Haynes, Walter, and Henry Haynes, Bristol, Chainmakers. March 12 at 12 at offices of Meers, Small st, Court Small
 Hobenton, Thomas, York, Commission Agent. March 13 at 11 at Griffith's Temperance Hotel, Linthorpe rd, Middlesborough. Bainbridge, Middlesborough
 Hubbard, Charles, Kinnerton st, Knightsbridge, Bootmaker. March 8 at 3 at the Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn
 Hunt, William, Folkestone, Innkeeper. March 9 at 3 at the Gun Tavern, Folkestone. Minter, Folkestone
 Isaac, Morgan, Llansadock, Carmarthen, Farmer. March 12 at 11 at the Royal Hotel, High st, Swansea. Lewis, Marthyr Tydfil
 Isaacs, David, Liverpool, Clothier. March 42 at 3 at offices of Sebright and Co, Clayton sq, Liverpool
 Jackson, Henry Charles, Rosamond buildings, Islington, Bootmaker. March 13 at 3 at offices of Vaux, Leadenhall st
 Jenkins, David Edward, Bristol, Accountant. March 8 at 11 at offices of Eversy, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol
 Johnson, John, Gateshead, Durham, Plateplayer. March 14 at 2 at office of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Jones, Thomas, Bristol, Oil Refiner. March 9 at 3 at offices of Clifton, Corn st, Bristol
 King, Samuel, Wakefield, York, Forgerman. March 13 at 3 at offices of Lodge, Park row, Leeds
 Lawrence, George, Doncaster, York, Plumber. March 16 at 11 at offices of Gray, Eldon st, Barnsley
 Lewis, Foss, Hants, Jeweller. March 9 at 4 at offices of King, North st, Forres
 Lloyd, John, Llansadock, Carmarthen, Farmer. March 12 at 1 at the Royal Hotel, High st, Swansea. Lewis, Marthyr Tydfil
 Maitby, Thomas, Nottingham, Tailor. March 13 at 12 at offices of Bolk, Middle pavement, Nottingham
 Marshall, John, Brinsford, York, Plumber. March 12 at 3 at offices of Chambers and Chambers, Bishouse
 Maxwell, George, Bacup, Lancashire, Brick Manufacturer. March 16 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Wright and Son, Bacup
 Mellone, Thomas, Colchester, Essex, Coal Merchant. March 13 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, Middleton and Marshall, Colchester
 Morton, Samuel, Needingworth, Huntingdon, Horse Dealer. March 12 at 12.30 at the Chequers Inn, March. Gaches, Peterborough
 Neel, James, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Beerhouse Keeper. March 10 at 3 at offices of Hall and Waite, Lowestoft
 Newton, Samuel, Bradford, Grocer. March 9 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Market st, Bradford
 Nobbs, Henry, Hornchurch, Essex, Manure Manufacturer. March 5 at 12 at offices of Preston, Mark lane
 Parfitt, George, Leeds, Plasterer. March 10 at 11 at offices of Lodge, Park row, Leeds
 Paskins, Robert, Hollingbourne, Kent, Grocer. March 15 at 3 at the Castle Hotel, Week st, Maidstone. Fenton Poet, John, Ulverston, Lancashire, Shipbuilder. March 10 at 11 at the Temperance Hall, Ulverston. Jackson Pike, Thomas, Birmingham, out of business. March 7 at 13 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Plimmer, William, Liscard, Cheshire, out of business. March 14 at 3 at offices of Vine, Dale st, Liverpool. Blinson, Liverpool
 Plock, Gottfried, Morton rd, Essex rd, out of business. March 14 at 3 at offices of Robinson, Coleman st, Christmas, Walbrook
 Porter, William, Manchester, General Agent. March 13 at 3 at offices of Harle, Market place, Manchester
 Randal, Henry William, Maldonstone, Bootmaker. March 12 at 2 at offices of Deane and Lickerish, Walbrook
 Rickett, Frederick Thomas, Shelfield, Kexx, Farmer. March 14 at 12 at the Saracen's Head Hotel, Chelmsford. Wood and Son, Rochford
 Roberts, John Vaughan, and Henry Owen Roberts, Liverpool, Confectioners. March 16 at 1 at offices of Nordon and Mason, Victoria st, Liverpool
 Shanklin, Elizabeth, Mary Ann Shanklin, and Margaret Shanklin, Hastings, formerly School Proprietors. March 13 at 11 at the White Hart Hotel, Upper Norwood. Richardson
 Shaw, Knock, Huddersfield, York, Plumber. March 15 at 11 at offices of Ramden and Sykes, John William st, Huddersfield
 Shippin, William, Leeds, Builder. March 14 at 3 at offices of Pulian, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds
 Smith, John, Bradford, Draper. March 12 at 10 at offices of Peel and Gault, Chapel lane, Bradford
 Sommerville, William, and Thomas Sommerville, Manchester, Cabinet Makers. March 8 at 3 at the Falstaff Hotel, Market place, Manchester
 Sommerville, Thomas, Sunderland, Durland, Ironmonger. March 12 at 11 at offices of Moore, John st, Sunderland
 Southwell, Simeon, and Harry Noble, Halifax, Worsted Spinner. March 13 at 3 at offices of Boocock, Silver st, Halifax
 Thomas, William, Dyerst, Flint, Quarryman. March 14 at 1 at the Queen Hotel, Chester. Roberts, Rhyd
 Toller, Alice, Gauder rd, Clapham. March 18 at 11 at offices of Moggy, Old Jewry chambers
 Tovey, William, Bristol, Hatter. March 10 at 11 at offices of Essery, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol
 Turner, David, Worcester, Livery Stable Keeper. March 9 at 3 at offices of Tree, The Avenue, Cross, Worcester
 Turner, George, Harsford, Clothier. March 9 at 12.30 at offices of Collins, Jan, Broad st, Bristol. Britton and Co, Bristol
 Wallwork, Roger, and Robert Whittaker Walwork, Manchester, Trimming Merchants. March 13 at 3 at offices of Crowther, York st, Macclesfield. Marritt and Woodall, Manchester
 Weaver, William, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Solicitor's Clerk. March 8 at 8 at offices of Ashmell, Cheapside, Hanley

Wheatley, George, Tushoe Grange, Durham, Confectioner. March 1st at 3 at offices of Brignal, Jun, Saddler st, Durham
 Wilkinson, Ebenezer, Millom, Cumberland, Joiner. March 20 at 3 at the Station Hotel, Millom, Butler, Millom
 Wilkinson, George, Castleford, York, Builder. March 12 at 11 at offices of Phillips, Carlton st, Castleford
 Wilson, John, Bradford, Fishmonger. March 9 at 11 at 52, Market st, Bradford. Cross and Cox
 Wilson, Thomas, Great Ayton, York, Butcher. March 3 at 3 at offices of Hope and Co, Corporation rd, Middlesbrough

PAINLESS DENTISTRY.

MR. G. H. JONES,
 SURGEON DENTIST,

57, GREAT RUSSELL-STREET, LONDON
 (Immediately opposite the British Museum).
 Has obtained Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent for his perfectly
 painless system of adapting
 (Prize Medal, London and Paris)

ARTIFICIAL TEETH BY ATMOSPHERIC PRESSURE.
 Pamphlet gratis and Post-free.

EDE AND SON.

ROBE MAKERS.



BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench
 Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS LTD.

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

AUCTION SALES FOR 1877.

MR. F. STATHAM HOBSON begs to direct the attention of Solicitors, Trustees, Mortgagors, and all interested in Landed Estates, Ground-Rents, Reversions, Advowsons, Life Policies, Property, &c., to his SALES by AUCTION, which will be held at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on the following days throughout the year 1877, at 9 o'clock precisely:—

Wednesday, March 7
 Wednesday, March 21
 Wednesday, April 11
 Wednesday, April 25
 Wednesday, May 9
 Wednesday, May 23
 Wednesday, June 13
 Wednesday, June 27

Wednesday, July 11
 Wednesday, July 25
 Wednesday, August 8
 Wednesday, August 22
 Wednesday, October 3
 Wednesday, October 24
 Wednesday, November 14
 Wednesday, December 12

Auctions can be held on other days in addition to those specified. Full particulars and information as to terms (which are arranged on a strictly moderate scale) for including properties of every description in the sales can be obtained, or will be forwarded on application at the Auction, Land Agency, and Valuation Offices, 20, Coleman-street, Bank, E.C.

Attractive and improving Freehold and Leasehold Investments.—Pembroke-square, Pembroke-crescent, Pembroke-villas, Ledbury-road, and Inverness-terrace.

MR. BEAL is instructed by the Executors of the late Mr. J. S. Abbott to offer for SALE, by AUCTION, at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, City, E.C., on WEDNESDAY, MAR. 14, at TWELVE for ONE precisely, in Lots (unless previously sold privately), the substantial FREEHOLD MANSION, No. 7, Pembroke-square, with stately saloons and numerous dormitories, elegantly appointed; lot on lease to a most acceptable tenant for an unexpired term of 18 years, at £250 per annum (worth certainly £450 per annum). The attractive LEASEHOLD RESIDENCE, No. 28, Pembroke-crescent, with possession; held for 67 years unexpired, at £15 ground-rent, estimated to produce £110 per annum. The capital LEASEHOLD SEMI-DETACHED RESIDENCE, No. 117, Inverness-terrace, held for 93 years from 1844 at £9 9s. ground-rent, sub-let for seven years at £100 per annum. The LEASEHOLD RESIDENCES, No. 4, Ledbury-road, and 40a, Pembroke-villas (Carlton House), held for an unexpired term of 66 years at £9 per annum each, sub-let for short terms at £145 5s. per annum.

Particulars and conditions may be had of

W. HARVEY, Esq., 6, Whitehall, S.W.:

Messrs. BOY & CARTWRIGHT, Solicitors, 4, Lothbury, E.C.; at the Mart; and of the Auctioneer, 20, Regent-street, Waterloo-place, S.W.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER'S LIST of ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground-Rents, Rent-Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C., or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for these should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

SOHO, CLOSE TO TOTTENHAM COURT-ROAD AND OXFORD-STREET.

Excellent Freehold Investment, producing a net income of £120 per annum, situate in a rapidly improving district, and in the immediate line of the proposed new street from Oxford-street to Charing-cross; the property is especially worthy the attention of trustees and others requiring a sound remunerative investment.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, & FARMER will SEL, at the MART, on TUESDAY next, MARCH 6th (unless previously disposed of by private contract) the valuable FREEHOLD PROPERTY, No. 9, Denmark-street, Soho, comprising a commodious private Dwelling-house of 12 rooms, besides kitchens and offices, and capital two-storyed modern work-shops with mounting-houses in the rear; the whole let to one responsible lessee on repairing lease at £120 per annum, and £2 10s. for insurance. The present lessee has spent a large sum upon the property in additions and permanent improvements since the lease was granted.

Particulars of

Messrs. E. W. & R. C. MOTE, Solicitors, 1, South-square, Gray's-inn; and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside.

LONDON GAZETTE (published by authority) and LONDON and COUNTRY ADVERTISEMENT OFFICE.
 NO. 117, CHANCERY LANE, FLEET STREET.

HENRY GREEN, Advertisement Agent, begs to direct the attention of the Legal Profession to the advantages of his long experience of upwards of thirty years, in the insertion of all pro forma notices, &c., and hereby solicits their continued support.—N.B. One copy of advertisement only required, and the strictest care and promptitude assured. Officially stamped forms for advertisement and file of "London Gazette" kept. By appointment.

SEASIDE EDUCATION for DAUGHTERS OF GENTLEMEN.—ST. EDMUND'S HOUSE, HUNSTANTON, NORFOLK, near SANDRINGHAM.—Mrs. and the Misses CALLOW RECEIVE and EDUCATE a limited number of YOUNG LADIES, who have every possible home comfort; resident German, French, and Musical Governesses; visiting Masters. Hunstanton is the only watering place on the East Coast of Great Britain having a westerly sea aspect, and stands in the Registrar General's returns on an average of twenty-five years as the healthiest place in England. Spring term will commence on Thursday, 25th January. Terms, references, &c., on application.

The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice.

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.

RICHARD FLINT & CO.

(Late ASH & FLINT),

3, Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet-street, London, E.C. (corner of Séries'-Inn). Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.

WATERLOW & SONS (LIMITED)

MULTIPLY X COPYING FORT FOLIO.

30 or 40 Copies of a Letter, Circular, Footcap Document, Draft, or Brief may be

PRINTED UPON THICK PAPER

From an Original Writing in a few minutes.

Prices, with Ink, &c., complete,

18s. 6d., 21s., 25s., 32s. 6d., and 37s. 6d.

INSTRUCTIONS FREE BY POST.

25, GREAT WINCHESTER STREET, LONDON.

YATES & ALEXANDER,
 PRINTERS, LITHOGRAPHERS, STATIONERS,
 ETC.
 CHANCERY-BUILDINGS, 23, CHANCERY-LANE,
 LONDON.

Every description of Printing.

Judicature Affidavits

Catalogues

Appeals

Prospectuses

Parliamentary Minutes

Magazines

Books

Newspapers

Pamphlets

Circulars

Reports

Posters

Reports

Handbills, &c., &c.

Rules